

# THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF RELIGIOUS PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION.

---

VOLUME 1

AUGUST, 1905.

No. 3

---

## THE PATHOLOGY OF RELIGIONS.<sup>1</sup>

BY JOSIAH MOSES,

*Honorary Fellow in Clark University.*

Pathology of Religions. The very title is sufficient to produce a variety of reactions in the different individuals who will read or hear it, and as in the case of so many titles and phrases we may expect it soon to be roundly abused by all parties. Those atheistically inclined will perhaps hail it with delight, and apply it indiscriminately to everything in all religions; the religious will recoil from it, but those who belong to no sect or party, and who are, therefore, unprejudiced will draw no hasty conclusions, but will calmly seek for its true scope and meaning, and, we hope, be rewarded in some measure for their pains. Certainly the last is the only proper attitude to assume in the study of this subject, as it is in all others.

The mine, here opened up with crude implements, is not altogether a new one. At least two other pioneers have dug in it and brought forth much valuable ore. One of these was M. Ernest Murisier, a young French *savant* whose early death was a great loss to the scientific world. His work<sup>2</sup> is a little masterpiece of psychological analysis, but its scope is limited to three chapters: Mysticism, Fanaticism, and Emotional Contagion. The other is Prof. Wm. James, whose more ambi-

<sup>1</sup>The writer gladly takes this opportunity to acknowledge his great indebtedness to Pres. G. Stanley Hall who first suggested the subject to him, and without whose continued help, encouragement, and inspiration the study could not have been completed.

<sup>2</sup>Les Maladies du Sentiment Religieux, Paris, 1901.

tious production<sup>1</sup> is already familiar to every one. The value of his labor is unfortunately minimized because he considered all his curious specimens pure ore and failed to see that the majority of them contained much dross and but little of the pure metal. Had he named his work "Varieties of Abnormal Religious Experience," and studied his materials from that point of view, it would have been undoubtedly the best so far produced on the subject. As it is, the work is confusing, distorted, and objectionable to a large class of readers who prefer to consider many if not most of the experiences he has collected and analyzed distinctly pathological rather than mere exaggerations of normal religious experiences. There is an important difference between disease and excessive strength or weakness.

Besides these two there have been many alienists who have noted religious aberrations of various sorts among their patients, and anthropologists who have carefully described scattered cases of pathological religious beliefs, rites, ceremonies, customs, etc., among primitive, ancient, and modern peoples, but no attempt has been made to collect, analyze, and classify these cases psychologically.

The present study modestly undertakes to do this. Its author has drawn all his materials, and many of his explanations from the works of alienists, anthropologists, missionaries, historians, and biographers; has studied these as impartially and classified them as best he could. He makes no claim to originality, except perhaps in method of treatment, and is conscious of its very many lacunæ and deficiencies. He has only sorted the crude ore leaving to more expert hands to do the smelting and refining.

The work is intended to parallel and complement in some measure the labors of Leuba, Starbuck, Coe, and others who have done so much to tell us the true psychological meaning of many of the normal religious experiences. For while dealing altogether with pathological religious experiences it throws considerable light indirectly upon those normal experiences of which they are the degenerations, and furnishes us a better and more complete picture of the birth, development, and decay of religion in the race and in the individual than the former could alone. It is also hoped that this study will be of service to religious pedagogues, in that it endeavors to mark with buoys the hidden rocks

<sup>1</sup> Varieties of Religious Experience.



and reefs on which so many religious ships in the past have foundered.

In no department of education are the need and importance of sound pedagogical principles so great as in religion, for no other has a subject which touches deeply so many sides and interests of human life. Religion is perhaps the oldest product of human feeling and thought, so old at any rate that many consider it one of the fundamental instincts. Its influence on the evolution of the race and on the life of the individual is simply incalculable, and therefore any error made in the inculcation of its principles is fraught with untold consequences. One poorly trained in mathematics, physics, languages, etc., is not nearly so dangerous a member of society as one poorly trained in religion, for the former are recent, accessory acquirements which do not begin to shape the character and conduct of the individual to the degree and extent that the latter does. A study of this sort should therefore be full of suggestions to those to whom the religious training of the young is intrusted. Its aim throughout is not to destroy but to fulfill, and the thought so well expressed by Dean Farrar has been constantly in the mind of its author: "We study the past not to denounce it, not to set ourselves above it, not to dis sever ourselves from its continuity, but to learn from it, and to avoid its failures. It has much to teach us by way of solemn warning. If we shall have to dwell upon its mistakes it is only that we may have grace to avoid them, and to be on our guard against similar tendencies."<sup>1</sup>

It is the opinion of the writer that the future will not be non-religious, as an ever-increasing number of scholars predict it will, but will possess a religion which will appropriate and assimilate the good of all the religions of the past and present, and will harmonize with its stage of development and satisfy the peculiar needs which only a religion of some sort can satisfy. It is already a platitude that each age has the religion which it deserves, but during transition periods it happens that progress is made along some lines much more rapidly than along others, and the difficulty of making proper adjustments is so great that impatient spirits grow restless and strive to force the adjustment even if they have to eliminate one or two important factors entirely. If old religion and the new science cannot immediately come to terms

<sup>1</sup>Hist. of Interpretation, p. 14.

the enthusiastic but short-sighted partisans of the latter are ready to sacrifice the former, while the religious enthusiasts are equally eager to disparage and even annihilate all science. Fortunately, these individuals are few and their power relatively small. The race moves slowly and cautiously regardless of the goading of the few, and instinctively refuses to lose anything that may be of value to it.

That of all things it will not leave Religion, the grandest legacy of the ages, behind, no one who is conversant with Volk-psychology and the trend of the present age will deny. Science is already halting in its mad and disappointing rush, and beginning to suspect that the promised land it was so eagerly "making for" is but a mirage or the phantom of an overwrought brain. Philosophy is bending all her energies to reconcile Science and Religion knowing that the alliance will be extremely beneficial to both in that it will save them from pessimism, despair, and deterioration.

Clifford's Cosmic Consciousness, the Panpsychism of Fechner, Stout, Strong, and others, the Pure Experiences of James, the new Humanism of Schiller, and the Pragmatism of the Chicago School, are all efforts I take it to bring about this reconciliation, that is, they are tendencies away from materialism and the crude conception of law which were the offspring of an immature science toward a new idealism which is always the closest ally of religion. Mysticism seems just now to be the ground on which both Science and Religion will meet, and if the present study will in any way hasten the day by removing the debris which lie scattered over the religious road, it will not have been in vain.

#### DEFINITION.

It is evident that just as in medicine, psychiatry, art, and ethics we must know physical and mental health, beauty, and goodness, in order to clearly understand disease, ugliness, and evil; so too in religion, a knowledge of its healthy normal condition, is a prerequisite to a knowledge of its abnormal, pathological condition. The one is as important as the other, and both must be kept constantly in countenance of each other, in order that each may shed light upon the other. In order, therefore, to determine what pathological religion is we must first determine what normal religion is.

What is religion? The history of the different answers that have



been made to this question, in the shape of definitions, forms a long and tedious chapter in the history of human thought. Almost every writer on religion from the earliest times down to the present has offered a different definition, and no one, it seems, is wholly satisfied with those proposed by the others. Nowhere does the old adage, "*Quot homines tot sententiæ*" hold more true than here. A classification and exposition of some of these definitions may not be without interest.

1. A great many writers, both ancient and modern, have looked upon religion of any kind as sheer madness, a symptom of a diseased brain. Thus Empedocles, in the fifth cent. B. C. declared it to be "a sickness of the mind," and Feuerbach of the last cent. characterized it as "the most pernicious malady of humanity." Likewise, Prof. Sergi, in a book just published,<sup>1</sup> offers many ingenious but non-valid arguments to prove that all religions, the highest as well as the lowest are absurd, pathological, and harmful to progress.<sup>2</sup>

2. A similar view, quite prevalent in all ages is that religion is a fraudulent invention of crafty priests and rulers; accepted by the ignorant and superstitious masses, and believed to be the highest truth. During the French Revolution this view reached its highest culmination. Hobbes defines religion as "superstition sanctioned by the State," and the poet Shelley conceived it to be one of his missions "to unveil the religious frauds by which nations have been deluded into submission." These are definitions offered by non-religious and irreligious individuals; definitions against, rather than of religion, and have therefore no scientific value.

3. There is another large group of writers and thinkers who define religion as 'revelation;' the product of something mysteriously and suddenly implanted in the soul of man by God—a faculty perhaps, but far superior to the other faculties and independent of them. Religion is therefore, not like language, art, science, government, etc., the product of centuries of human thought and action, but it is something which, Minerva-like springs into the soul full-grown and mature. The laws of evolution do not hold in religion.

4. Again, there are the views of narrow-minded sectarians who hold that the only religion worthy of the name is their own; all others

<sup>1</sup>*L'Origine dei Fenomeni Psicici*, Jan., 1904.

<sup>2</sup>Others hold that religion is a collection of superstitious beliefs and superstitious forms of worship which accord with them.

are base superstitions and idolatries. This view has received its best expression in Milton's *Paradise Lost*, and is not uncommon in some parts even to-day.

Of the definitions which are more philosophical and scientific, Prof. Leuba has given us a valuable collection which he classifies as follows:<sup>1</sup>

In the first group, which may be called the Noetic group, "a specific intellectual element is given as the essence, or as the distinguishing mark of religion." Thus, Martineau defines religion as, "a belief in an Ever-living God, that is, in a Divine mind and will ruling the universe and holding moral relations with mankind."

Romanes: "Religion is a department of thought having for its objects a self-conscious and intelligent Being."

D'Alviella: Religion is, "The belief in the existence of superhuman beings who interfere in a mysterious fashion in the destiny of man."

Hegel: Religion is, "The knowledge possessed by the finite mind of its nature as absolute mind."

In the second, or Feeling and Æsthetic group, "it is one or several specific feelings which are singled out as the Religious Differentia."

Schliermacher: "Religion cannot and will not originate in the pure impulse to know . . . . It is neither thinking nor acting, but intuition and feeling." Later he wrote: "Religion is a feeling of absolute dependence."

Herbart: "Sympathy with the universal dependence of men is the essential natural principle of all religion."

Goethe, in *Faust*:

"Nenn's Glück! Herz! Liebe! Gott!  
Ich habe keinen Namen  
Dafür, Gefühl ist alles."

A. Sabatier: "That which we call religion in a man is the sentiment of the relation in which he stands and wants to stand to the universal principle upon which he knows himself to be dependent, and to the universe itself of which he finds himself a part."

Upton: "It is the felt relationship in which the finite self-consciousness stands to the immanent and universal ground of all being, which constitutes religion."

<sup>1</sup>Intro. to a Psychological Study of Religion, *Monist*, Jan., 1901.



In the third, or Volitional and Ethical group, "the active principle, the cravings, the desires, the impulses, the will, take the place occupied by the intellect or the feelings in the other classes."

Bradley: "Religion is the attempt to express the complete reality of goodness through every aspect of our being."

Feuerbach: "The origin, nay the essence of religion is desire; if man possessed no needs, no desires, he would possess no gods."

Marshall: "The restraint of individualistic impulses to racial ones (the suppression of our wills to a higher will) seems to me to be of the very essence of religion: the belief in the Deity, as usually found, being from the psychological point of view an attachment to, rather than the essence of, the religious feeling."

The Golden Rule, which is the motto of so many religions, may be cited here as emphasizing this element to the exclusion of almost all the others. Likewise, the Apostle Paul: "What doth it profit though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? can faith save him?" Right willing and doing is for him the essence of religion, rather than beliefs and theological dogmas.

That these definitions are all more or less one sided need hardly be pointed out. Each one as we should expect, finds in religion that which is predominant in his own soul. Goethe could not have possibly been true to himself and said anything else than, "Name it what you will, for me it is all feeling." Spencer, Romanes, and other investigators were by their natures compelled to define it in terms of the intellect, and likewise the men of action like Paul and Bondaref were compelled to define it in terms of will and conduct. Such definitions are valuable more for the light they shed on individual psychology, than for their aid in the solution of the question 'What is religion?' The other writers whom we have quoted, deluded by the fatal faculty psychology endeavored, either by analyzing and comparing the different historical religions to arrive at the origin, the seed from which they all sprang, or, by eliminating all that is characteristic of the different species, to discover the one quality or essence common to all; a '*sum-mum genus*' from which as a starting point they might construct a religious tree a la Haeckel.

All the various theories concerning the origin of religion are nothing more than mere idle guesses in the dark. Its roots lie so deeply and intricately imbedded and enmeshed in the past of the race that it has



now become almost an instinct, which in its proper time, and under normal conditions, sprouts forth spontaneously from the dark and impenetrable regions of the individual's sub-consciousness. To say that religion was born of the emotions, or the intellect, or the will, is to arbitrarily partition the soul into three air-tight compartments, a procedure which flagrantly violates the truth and for which there is absolutely no justification. The soul is an organic unity of inseparable parts, which develop, ripen, and decay concomitantly and covariantly. When in its gradual evolution it finally reached the mature chrysalis state and was beginning to emerge into a beautiful butterfly, *i. e.*, when our simian ancestors were becoming more human than ape, then many wonderful changes must have taken place and new conditions pregnant with future possibilities were born. It was then that the veil was lifted from the eyes of our ancestors; they beheld the wonders and mysteries of the starry heavens, and the forces of nature playing about them; they caught a glimpse of God, were filled with wonder, admiration, awe, curiosity, and fear, the bud unfolded itself, and the beautiful flower, religion, was born in the world. This, figurative and fanciful as it is, is probably the most that can be said concerning its birth. The Dutch botanist, Hugo de Vries, maintains that new types can arise suddenly. Great variations, not small, as Darwin thought, are, according to him the condition of evolution through the struggle for life. If religion be the product of some such sudden mental variation, the futility of trying to trace it back to an instinct, or feeling, or will-act, would be all the more manifest.

Of the essence of religion we can likewise make no dogmatic statement. There are no two religions, we venture to say, whose essences are precisely the same; indeed, we may go even further and say that as many men so many religions. We should more accurately speak of religions than of religion, which exists only as an abstract term or idea. Instead of vainly endeavoring to discover the origin or essence of religion several recent writers have wisely undertaken to ascertain the meaning of the religions which the different peoples, primitive, and civilized, now possess and the influence they exert upon their lives. Here we may mention among others the following definitions:

Eliza Ritchie: "When we speak of a religious man or race, we have in view a certain temper of mind, a certain way of conceiving the facts of existence, a doctrine of some sort. But we also know that a



doctrine itself, however elaborate it may be, does not constitute a religion. When the doctrine affects the whole tone and color of the individual's emotional life, and has a determining influence upon his conduct, then the individual may be said to be religious . . . Whether the creed be low or lofty, simple or complex, it must be *felt*: whether its outer expression consist in ceremony or ritual, moral precepts or ethical principles, philanthropic work or fanatical persecutions, some effect it must have on the emotional and practical life; if either of these factors be wholly absent, the phenomenon is not that of religion."<sup>1</sup>

Ed. Caird: "Without as yet attempting to define religion . . . we may go as far as to say that a man's religion is the expression of his ultimate attitude to the Universe, the summed-up meaning and purport of his whole consciousness of things."

Pfleiderer: "In the religious consciousness, all sides of the whole personality participate."

Tolstoi: "True religion is a relation, accordant with reason and knowledge, which man establishes with the infinite life surrounding him, and it is such as binds his life to that infinity, and guides his conduct."<sup>2</sup>

As definitions, there are obvious objections to be raised against each of these, but the point which they emphasize, namely, that religion is an experience which involves all the activities of the psyche,—beliefs, emotional responses, and volitional acts of various kinds, and shapes in large measure the lives and conduct of men, evinces a deeper and broader insight of the true nature of religion and its relation to life than any of the definitions we have quoted above. We shall never, perhaps, have a perfectly adequate and satisfactory definition of religion, and it is doubtful whether such a definition is at all necessary. The above facts taken in connection with the vague, mystical, intellectual and emotional aura of which each one is more or less cognizant when in the religious mood are sufficient both to differentiate religious experiences from the secular experiences of life, and to define the nature of religion. It is, however, incumbent upon a writer on the subject to state as clearly and concisely as possible his own conception of religion in order that the reader may be better able to follow him and under-

<sup>1</sup> *The Essentials of Religion*, Phil. Rev., Jan., 1901.

<sup>2</sup> *Essays and Letters*, p. 295.

stand his conclusions. The following should be taken, therefore, not as a standard definition of religion, but as the writer's attempt to state in as few words as possible his conception of the meaning of the term. Religion is a whole-souled or rather a psychophysical reaction to one or more preternatural objects or beings, or to ideals which are believed to be somehow constantly and seriously related to the individual and the race. We employ the term preternatural rather than supernatural because it is hardly fitting to characterize the gods and idols of some primitive peoples as supernatural. Indeed, many of them did not themselves consider their gods as such, and yet they were not what can be properly called natural, they were in every case something other than natural, *i. e.*, preternatural.

Now that we have stated as best we can what we mean by normal religion we can more readily explain what we mean by pathological religion. In an off-hand fashion, it may be said that that religious experience which is not a well-rounded, well-balanced reaction of the whole soul is pathological; but in saying this it must be remembered that not all people react with the same fullness or force, nor in the same way. There are all stages of religious development in the individual as well as in the race, and the reaction which is normal to one stage of development is different from that which is normal to another. Indeed, what is normal for one may be pathological for the other. We cannot, therefore, have a hard and fixed standard of measurement for all religions, but must employ a different standard for each religion. The child and savage cannot be expected to have as lofty and abstract religious conceptions as have the Buddhists, for example, or the modern Christians, but they are justly expected to have the religious conceptions and experiences which are normal to their stage of development; anything short of that is an evidence of arrested development or degeneration. In the field of morals we are told that the individual should act in accordance with the idea of his kind or his type,<sup>1</sup> and the same rule applies to religion as well. In judging, therefore, of an individual's or race's religious normality we must compare them not with individuals belonging to another race, but with those of their own, with their ancestors and neighbors who grew up with them in the same envi-

<sup>1</sup> See Alexander, *Moral Order and Progress*, p. 236; Leslie Stephen: *Science of Ethics*, p. 397.



ronment and under similar conditions. And within this compass we shall meet with all degrees of growth and decay, *i. e.*, among Christians, Jews, Mohammedans, Buddhists, etc., there are sects and denominations who hold religious views and perform religious rites which are abnormal to the stage of development of their respective religions.

Unfortunately, however, our knowledge of the life-history of the different tribes and races, especially the primitive ones; the conditions of their social, intellectual, and natural environments, is in many cases too fragmentary and uncertain to enable us to determine whether their religious development has kept pace with their moral, social, and intellectual development, or whether it has been arrested or degenerated. Of the religions of certain peoples who are our neighbors and contemporaries, such for instance as the Holy Orthodox Greek Church of Russia with its numerous sects and fifteen millions of schismatics, and in our own country the Christian Catholic Church, or Dowieism, Christian Scientists, the Society of the Holy Ghost and Us, and many others, there is certain and almost complete knowledge, and therefore we have no hesitancy in stigmatizing them as more or less pathological. Of the religions of many primitive peoples, however, we can make no such definite statement. It is difficult to understand the people and get into sympathetic rapport with their religions, and besides our knowledge of them is largely derived from the reports of tourists and missionaries, whose observations were unscientific, to say the least. There is one criterion, however, of which we are sure, namely, the effects of the religions upon their adherents. Religion like government is of, for, and by the people, and like government it is of positive value only when it serves the needs of the people, makes life more moral and joyful, and aids them in their normal development. But just as there are autocratic and tyrannical forms of government which militate against the mental and material welfare and progress of the subjects, so too are there religions which, instead of being subservient to their votaries have terrorized and enslaved them, inoculated them with the virus of pessimism, made death a boon, and hindered their normal development in countless different ways. Such religions cannot but be considered pathological.

“Insanity,” writes E. Stanley Abbot, “is a morbid condition of the mind which renders it impossible for the conscious individual to think, feel, or act, *in relation to his environment, in accordance with the*

*standards of his bringing up,'*<sup>1</sup> and Dr. Brinton speaking of racial insanity, says: "A pathological condition of the ethnic mind is present when it is chronically incapable of directing the activities of the group correctly toward self-preservation and development."<sup>2</sup> Basing our criterion on these facts we shall hold that whenever the religious experiences or practices *injure* the psychical or physical condition of the individual or group, or retard their growth so that they cannot think, act, or feel in relation to their environments, in accordance with the standards normal to their stages of development, they are positively pathological.

With this criterion constantly in mind, and remembering that the religious state is a *combined effect* of many, if not all psychic experiences and activities, and not a *compound* composed of separable units we shall analyze some of the religions of primitive, ancient, medieval, and modern peoples into their emotional, intellectual, and volitional elements, for the same reason that psychologists analyze consciousness into sensation, perception, conception, memory, imagination, emotion, will, reasoning, association, etc., and endeavor to show that an excessive exaggeration or elimination of any one of the elements produces a disharmonious relationship between them, so to speak, and leads to degeneration of the whole state.

### THE EMOTIONAL ELEMENT IN RELIGION.

#### *Love.*

That love plays a large rôle in the religious experiences of all peoples will readily be admitted by every one, but that love itself is an irradiation of the sexual instinct some perhaps will be inclined to doubt. Biologists, anthropologists, and alienists, however, are almost unanimous on this point, and philology renders the same verdict. The English word 'love,' the German *lieben*, the Danish *lieven*, Russian 'lioblyu,' and Latin 'lubeo,' are all derived from the Sanscrit root-word 'loab,' which means desire, lust, passion. The same is true of the Hebrew word for 'love.' That the instinct which attracts the sexes for the purpose of re-creation is the root from which all love has grown

<sup>1</sup> *Am. Jour. Insanity*, July, 1902.

<sup>2</sup> *The Basis of Social Relations*, p 84.



is an established fact, and now that we understand better and more truly the evolution of the race, the rôle of sexual selection, the meaning of reproduction in the plant and animal series, we need no longer be ashamed of the parentage of our noblest emotion. There is a natural dynamic relationship between religion and sex ; the two are inextricably interwoven, so to speak, and influence each other at every turn. In the biographies and autobiographies of saints, both male and female, of monks, nuns, and enthusiastic religionists in general we find that sexual disturbances irradiate and produce marked religious disturbances such as erotic trances, visions, hallucinations, mystic experiences, etc. Unable to express itself naturally the sexual impulse finds an outlet in a more or less sensuous love of God, Christ, or the Virgin Mary.

A single example must suffice: "I wish the divine love," cried Mme. Guyon, whose married life was loveless and most unhappy, "the love which chills the soul with ineffable shivers, the love which puts me in a swoon." And later when she had experienced the mystic union with God, she wrote, "O! my God, if you should make the most sensual persons feel what I feel, they would soon leave their false pleasures to enjoy one so true." In the writings of Ruysbroeck, Fenelon, St. Theresa, Catherine of Sienna, St. Gertrude, and numerous others, especially the mystics, similar expressions are to be found.

Alienists have found numerous evidences of this close relationship in their patients. Schroeder van der Kolk writes, "I venture to express my conviction that we should rarely err, if in a case of religious melancholy we assumed the sexual apparatus to be implicated." Likewise Krafft-Ebing, "It suffices to recall how intense sexuality makes itself manifest in the clinical history of many religious maniacs; the motley mixture of religious and sexual delusions that is so frequently observed in psychoses (*e. g.* in maniacal women who think they are or will be the mother of God), but particularly in masturbatic insanity; and finally, the sexual, cruel self-punishment, injuries, self-castrations, and even self-crucifixions resulting from abnormal religio-sexual feeling."<sup>1</sup> Esquirol, Friedreich, Regis, Berthier, Conolly Norman, Ball, Brouardel, Morselli, C. H. Hughes, Vallon and Marie, Spitzka, Jos. Workman, and others are all agreed on this point.

A study of these and other facts, such as the remarkable synchron-

<sup>1</sup> *Psychopathia Sexualis*, p. 8.

ism of the ages of religion, *i. e.*, pubescence and senescence, and that of sexual maturity and impotence, the fact that adolescent insanity is to a large extent due to disorders of the reproductive function, and that in many cases the insanity expresses itself in religious exaltation, the many interesting and suggestive parallelisms between love and religion<sup>1</sup> have led writers like Wier,<sup>2</sup> Howard,<sup>3</sup> Forlong,<sup>4</sup> Westropp,<sup>5</sup> and others to find in the sexual instinct the one root of all religions. We cannot agree with these extremists, nor on the other hand with Prof. Wm. James<sup>6</sup> who sees no relationship whatever between religion and sex, but prefer to say with Brinton that it is the sexual instinct "which in some of its forms, rude or refined, is at the root of half the expressions of the religious sentiment. We may trace it from crude and coarse beginnings in the genesaic cults of primitive peoples, through ever nobler and more delicate expressions, up through the celibate sacrifices of both sexes; spouses of God, until in its complete expansion it reaches the perfect agape, where the union of the human with the divine in the life eternal, here on earth, or beyond, one and the same, is believed to have been reached."<sup>7</sup> The sexual instinct exerts a great influence on art, morality, thought, in fact on all life. Is it possible that it has no connection with one of the oldest and most fundamental of all human experiences?

We believe that in its widest possible sense it is true that "He that loveth not, knoweth not God for God is love."

Among primitive peoples this dynamic relationship appears, as we should expect, more clearly than among more advanced races. The mysteries of procreation and reproduction impressed the naïve and childish mind of primitive man as much, perhaps, as the celestial bodies, and the mysterious was always deified. Phallicism, or phallo-ktenism was universal among all early races and still obtains among the savages of to-day. Everything about them, the celestial bodies, mountains and

<sup>1</sup> Pres. Hall: Adolescence, Vol. 2, pp. 295-301 contains the best collection of these.

<sup>2</sup> Religion and Lust, Louisville, Ky., 1897.

<sup>3</sup> Sex Worship, Washington, D. C., 1897.

<sup>4</sup> Rivers of Life, London.

<sup>5</sup> Primitive Symbolism, London, 1885.

<sup>6</sup> Varieties of Religious Experience, p. 11 foot note.

<sup>7</sup> Religions of Primitive Peoples, p. 170. Cf. Baring-Gould, Freaks of Fanaticism, p. 268, and Havelock Ellis, Psych. of Sex. Vol. 2. Appendix C.



rivers, stocks and stones, trees and plants as well as the animals and themselves possessed sex and other mysterious attributes; hence, their countless male, female, and androgynous divinities and demons. Later, when they reached the symbolic stage it was but natural that they should select their own sexual organs as fitting symbols of the hidden powers that were constantly creating life. There was nothing pathological in this, nor even superstitious, in the true sense of the word; it was all perfectly normal to their stage of development. But just so soon as the symbolic nature of their phallic emblems and idols was forgotten, and the organs or their representations were worshipped as divinities themselves, or when the people continued to perform phallic ceremonies after they had outgrown the cult, then the religion and its practices became degenerate and pathological. "Indecent rites," says Constant, "may be practiced by a religious people with the greatest purity of heart. But when incredulity has gained a footing amongst these peoples, these rites become then the cause and pretext of the most revolting corruption."<sup>1</sup> Likewise Voltaire: "Our ideas of propriety lead us to suppose that a ceremony which appears to us infamous could only be invented by licentiousness; but it is impossible to believe that licentiousness and depravity of manners would ever have led among any people to the establishment of religious ceremonies; profligacy may have crept in in the lapse of time, but the original institution was always innocent and free from it; the early agape, in which girls and boys kissed one another modestly on the mouth, degenerated at last into secret meetings and licentiousness. It is, therefore, probable that this custom was first introduced in times of simplicity, that the first thought was to honor the Deity in the symbol of life which it has given us."

It is not necessary to enter into disgusting details to prove that these simple and innocent customs did too frequently degenerate into licentious orgies which were injurious to the mental, moral, and physical health of the participants, and were therefore pathological. The mere names of some of the rites and festivals will suffice. Among the ancient Chaldeans, Babylonians, Corinthians, Armenians and others the women frequently united themselves with strangers in the Temples. Similar customs prevailed among the different North and South American Indian tribes. In Mendes the women submitted themselves nude

<sup>1</sup> Human Polytheism.

and openly to the embraces of the sacred goat, which represented the incarnation of the procreative deity. The Kauchilaus performed shameful religious ceremonies in which all family ties were completely obliterated. Among all the ancients delubral hetarism, the prelibation and *jus primae noctis* rites were quite common. Many Greek and Roman temples were dedicated to the phallus and filled with hetaræ. In the scathing satires of Juvenal who tells us in one place that every temple in Rome was practically a licensed brothel, in the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, the writings of Suetonius, Tacitus, Seneca, St. Augustine and Gibbon we learn to what depths of moral degradation and licentiousness the Romans had fallen in their religious ceremonies and festivals, such as that of Venus, the Bacchanalia, Florolia, Saturnalia, Liberalia and others. These practices were common throughout Europe during the Middle Ages, and have not yet entirely disappeared.

Again, the worship of certain animals such as the serpent, bull, goat, cock, tortoise, and others; the worship of trees, such as the pine, fir, oak, fig, palm, etc.; the worship of plants, vegetables, and cereals such as the lotus, onion, rice, maize, turnip, sweet potato, etc.; the worship of mounds, rocks, stone pillars,—all have more or less phallic significance and are degenerations of purer and more primitive forms of natural religion.

The above excesses are paralleled in many religions by excesses even more injurious in the opposite direction. In every age and clime there have been those who imagined that their deities were best served when all sexual affairs were abstained from, when the sexual nature was completely abnegated. Mere continence or celibacy was deemed insufficient, the sexual organs had to be extirpated. The ceremony of castration formed a part of the annual celebration of the festival of Attis and Cybele, and is still practiced by the Skoptsy, a religious sect in Russia. Masculine hetarism also still obtains among many primitive peoples, and is distinctly a religious rite.<sup>1</sup> One of the motives which lie behind these practices is a strong desire to please and propitiate the deity by sacrificing the greatest of human blessings and pleasures in accordance with the ancient and widespread belief that God is always best pleased when his creatures are most miserable, and hence the greater the sacrifice, the greater the pleasure afforded him. Again, the desire to stifle

<sup>1</sup> Letourneau: *La Religion*, p. 62.



the promptings of the carnal nature, to renounce all worldly affairs, and to wrap themselves entirely in God were the motives which prompted the struggles of the early Christian Fathers, and the many devotees who followed in their footsteps almost to the present day." Among primitive peoples the practice was probably of accidental origin and was perpetuated because it rendered the subjects peculiar and gained for them the respect and reverence of their fellows who considered them as somehow or other divine.

### *Hate.*

The opposite of love is hate, and like the opposite sides of a shield they are always together. The good lover is also a good hater, and *vice versa*. "In the love of Christ and his maid-mother," declared Queen Isabella, "I have caused great misery, and have depopulated towns and districts, provinces and kingdoms." Jonathan Edwards and Andrew Welwood delighted to picture to themselves the sufferings of the wicked. "I am overjoyed," wrote the latter, "in hearing the everlasting howlings of the haters of the Almighty. What a pleasant melody they are in mine ears! O, Eternal hallelujahs to Jehovah and the Lamb! O, sweet! sweet! My heart is satisfied. We committed our cause to Thee that judgeth righteously, and behold Thou hast fully pleaded our cause, and shall make the smoke of their torment forever and ever to ascend in our sight." Even the great Preacher Himself, He who preached to the world the Gospel of Love declared, "If any one come to Me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters yea, and his own life also, he cannot be My disciple." These injunctions were too literally obeyed by very many ascetics and fanatics of succeeding generations. St. Jerome, exulting in his own atrophied and diseased feelings, tells Heliodorus whom he exhorts to leave his family and become a hermit, "Though your little nephew twine his arms around your neck; though your mother with dishevelled hair and tearing her robe asunder, point to the breast with which she suckled you; though your father fall down on the threshold before you, pass on over your father's body. Fly with tearless eyes to the banner of the cross. In this matter cruelty is the only piety. . . . Your widowed sister may throw her gentle arms around you. . . . Your father may implore you to wait but a short time to bury those near to

you, who will soon be no more; your weeping mother may recall your childish days, and may point to her shrunken breast and to her wrinkled brow. Those around you may tell you that all the household rests upon you. Such chains as these, the love of God and the fear of hell can easily break. You say that Scripture orders you to obey your parents, but he who loves them more than Christ loses his soul, etc.' The Lives of the Saints are full of accounts of the cruelties of their subjects to their parents and nearest kin. Indeed it seems that the Christianity of the Middle Ages was a religion of hate and not of love as its Founder and His disciples intended it to be. "To outrage the affections of the nearest and dearest relations," writes Mr. Lecky, "was usually regarded not only as innocent, but proposed as the highest virtue. 'A young man,' it was acutely said, 'who has learnt to despise a mother's grief, will easily bear any other labor that is imposed upon him.'"<sup>1</sup>

To tell the story of religious hate, the rôle it has played in the history of man, would necessitate a recounting of all the religious wars, massacres, holocausts, inquisitions, persecutions, witchcraft trials, etc., the perusal of which sickens the soul and makes passionate men cry out against religion itself. Suffice it to say that while love is the keynote of almost all religious teachings, both oral and written, hate has so far played the leading rôle in religious history and made it one long tragedy.

Mention should here be made of a peculiar religion which seems to have been born entirely of hate and cruelty. It is called Thugism and was discovered in India by the English in the early part of the nineteenth century. The devotees of this religion were murderers who committed their crimes according to rigidly prescribed forms; only after the performance of special religious rites, and always scrupulously divided their spoils with their cruel goddess. The instruments of murder and burial were held by them in the highest veneration. An oath taken by the pick-axe was as binding to them as the Koran is to the Mohammedan, or the Bible to the Christian. They did not consider themselves murderers, but merely pious agents working out the will of their goddess. They held their profession in the highest esteem.

<sup>1</sup> Hist. of European Morals, Vol. 2, p. 142.



*Pity.*

It would be difficult indeed to overestimate the rôle that pity has played not only in the religious life, but in the secular life as well. Pres. Hall,<sup>1</sup> in one of his searching articles, has shown what a large and important part it plays in the lives of children and adults; and Herbart, as we have already seen, considered it the essential principle of religion. In both the Old and New Testaments God is called a merciful and pitying God, and want of pity is considered an unpardonable sin. "For three transgressions of Edom, and for four (saith the Lord), I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because he did pursue his brother with the sword, and did cast off all pity, and his anger did tear perpetually, and he kept his wrath forever."<sup>2</sup> Some writers have spoken of pity as the essential teaching of Christianity. It certainly takes rank next to love. "The sentiment of pity," writes Pres. Hall, "has played a rôle of supreme importance in the spread of Christianity. Hundreds of returns specify particularly all the experiences of Passion week. Some are most completely melted at the desertion of Christ by his disciples, others at the betrayal, others by his struggles of soul with himself and with the Father in Gethsemane, but most prominent of all in this galaxy of incitations to pathos is the crucifixion itself and the incidents connected with it. The stations of the Cross are often mentioned: Christ commending his mother to the care of the beloved disciple; the prayer, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do;' Christ met by his mother on the way to Calvary; taken from the Cross and laid upon the bosom of the mother of sorrows; the scene where Christ is stripped of his garments, his flesh bruised and torn from the scourging; the long journey up the hill with the heavy Cross and the three falls under its weight; Mary at the foot of the Cross seeing the Divine Son suffer and unable to even wipe the blood from his face."<sup>3</sup>

But these incidents do not bring tears to the eyes of all. God on the Cross would not excite pity in Nietzsche, for instance; he would turn away from such a spectacle with shame and scorn. The 'Übermensch' he tells us, "maketh his law to be ashamed in the presence of all that suffereth." And again, "Thus the devil once said unto me:

<sup>1</sup>Saunders and Hall: "Pity," *Amer. Jour. Psy.*, Vol. 11, July, 1900.

<sup>2</sup>Amos, ch. 1, vs. 11.

<sup>3</sup>See especially *The Passion vs The Resurrection. Am. Jour. of Religious Psy. and Ed.*, Vol. 1, May, 1904.

‘Even God hath his own hell: that is his love unto men.’ . . . .  
 ‘And recently I heard the word said: ‘God is dead; he hath died of his pity for man.’ ” Zeno and Spinoza regard pity bad in itself, and Darwin in his theory of the ‘survival of the fittest’ has little or no room for it. But the ‘survival of the fittest’ law is unfit for civilized men, as indeed it is for all the higher animals. Were this the supreme and inviolable law of nature the higher forms of life could not have evolved. The higher the animal is in the scale of life the fewer are its offspring, and the greater and longer are their periods of helplessness. Had not nature therefore evolved love, and pity, and sympathy, these offspring would, according to the above law, be either devoured or left to perish. But nature has implanted the tender instincts in the hearts of parents, and as a consequence we find them instinctively violating Darwin’s law and risking their lives for the survival of the weak and the unfit. M. Kropatkin, in his recent masterly work, *Mutual Aid*, shows convincingly that the severe ‘struggle for survival,’ of which so much has been made since Darwin, is more or less a myth. Mutual aid rather than mutual destruction is according to him, the reigning law in the animal world. From love and pity of one’s own progeny, these emotions irradiate and cover the progeny of others of the same species, and finally to everything that is powerless and helpless, the young and old alike. In man these emotions are sometimes so highly developed as to be entirely divorced from reason. Man loves and pities he knows not why, and not infrequently when he knows he should not. From this to a pathological development of pity is but a short step.

The true pedagogy of pity is, as Pres. Hall has shown, not to eradicate it entirely from the soul, nor, on the other hand, to lavish it promiscuously and indiscriminately upon “the undervitalized poor, the moribund sick, defectives, and criminals, because by aiding such to survive, the process of wholesome natural selection by which all that is best has hitherto been developed, will be interfered with. Pity needs new ideals. Its work is no longer the salvage of the wreckage of humanity, but if Jesus came to our biological age he would be crucified afresh in the thwarted ambitions and blighted ideals of those most noble, yet most often crushed by circumstances over which they have no control. Pity has as its highest office then, in removing handicaps from those most able to help man to higher levels,—the leaders on more exalted plains who can be of most aid in ushering in the kingdom of the



superman.” In other words we must learn not to cease to pity but to pity aright.

Like the other emotions, pity has, at times, been unduly focused upon and led to many morbid excesses. Pity and sympathy are the nearest approaches we have to suffering and pain, and in some cases they actually pass over into the latter. Cases of religious stigmatization like that of St. Francis of Assissi and Louise Lateau, are the most extreme and pathological examples of this. For more than four years blood flowed regularly every Friday from the left side of the latter's chest, from both feet, the palms and backs of both hands, and also her forehead. According to her physician, Dr. Lefebvre, the quantity of blood lost on each occasion was about seven-eighths of a quart.<sup>1</sup>

In many of Pres. Hall's returns a single incident was singled out of a whole situation. The very sound of the word ‘nail’ produced a nervous shudder in one; another, “on seeing old nails that looked antique felt a pain in her palms, and sometimes in her feet from the strength of her imagination.” Still another felt them so intensely that it seems quite likely “that she is well on toward stigmata.”<sup>2</sup> In all, twenty-eight were profoundly affected by nail items; others centered on the sharp thorns, the vinegar, falling under the Cross, trial before Pilate, etc.

The religious sect which has focused upon pity more, perhaps, than any other is that of the Jains of India. These believe that every object, even plants, minerals, water, fire, etc., possesses a soul, and therefore they abstain from destroying even the minutest animal, deeming the destruction of any sentient creature the most heinous of crimes. Lest they should accidentally tread upon an insect they always carry at their girdles a small broom with which they tenderly sweep aside every insect which they may observe in their path. “To so senseless a length do they carry this principle, that they will not pluck any herb or vegetable, or partake of any sort of food, which may be supposed to contain animalculæ; so that the only articles of sustenance remaining to them appear to be rice, and a few sorts of pulse, which they cook with milk. They affirm, indeed, that it is as foul a murder to kill an insect as to slay a man; and so extreme is their precaution to avoid the commission of the crime, that it is with great reluctance, and only when re-

<sup>1</sup> F. W. H. Meyers: *Human Personality*, Vol. 1, p. 492.

<sup>2</sup> Hall: *loc. cit.*, p. 559.

duced to the necessity by urgent thirst, that they will drink water; even then they invariably suck up the fluid through a piece of fine muslin. In like manner when they require water for ablution, or any unavoidable household purpose, they carefully strain it repeatedly before they venture to use it. The most noxious vermin and insects are also treated with the same consideration as the most harmless creatures; and if, through persevering annoyance, they are compelled to deprive certain odious insects of the asylum usually found upon their persons, they remove the tormentors with the utmost care, and tenderly place them out of harm's way."<sup>1</sup> This is closely paralleled by the beliefs and actions of the Doukhobors in Canada, who refuse to eat meat, and to own and work with animals, etc., by the intense pity which some women and children have for animals, insects, plants, and even inanimate objects, such as, locomotives when 'puffing,' "the moon when black clouds pass over it," etc.

Again, this sentiment becomes almost pathological among vegetarians, and in the nervous and violent crusades against vivisection, even of the most humane, painless, and scientific kind.

### *Fear.*

"Fear is the father of religion, love her late-born daughter."—Alfred Maury. In every age and land there have been those who have held that fear is the source of all religions. King Solomon declared that, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge," and had he been speaking of the origin of religion he would have probably added, 'and of religion.' Petronius long ago sang, "Fear first made the gods," and in our own day, to mention only a few, D'Alviella and Alfred Maury regard this sentiment as one root of religion of which the other is love. The Italian anthropologist, Sergi, offers many ingenious arguments to prove that one of the main roots of all religions is irrational fear, due to man's ignorance of natural laws; and Paul Carus evidently agrees with Petronius when he writes, "Demonolatry or Devil-worship is the first stage in the evolution of religion, for we fear the bad not the good."<sup>2</sup>

These views are, of course, extreme and partial, like some of those

<sup>1</sup>Dict. of All Religions.

<sup>2</sup>Hist. of the Devil.



concerning love. Nevertheless, it is true that fear has played and still plays, in the religion of all peoples, a rôle hardly second to that of any other emotion, and therefore merits the great importance attached to it. If it be true as Dr. Robertson Smith says, that the spirit of many primitive religions is "predominantly joyous;" it is no less true that the spirit of as many more is predominantly timid, and in few, if any, is the element of fear entirely absent. "Every bright god has his shadow, so to say; and under the influence of Dualism this shadow attained a distinct existence and personality in the popular imagination."<sup>1</sup>

Primitive and ancient peoples have their 'kakodaimonai' as well as their 'eudaimonai,' their demons as well as their divinities, their Ahrimans as well as their Ormuzds. This holds true even of the Jews and Christians. The God of these people is at one time, a loving and merciful God, an indulgent "Father that pitieth his children;" at another time he is jealous and vindictive, a 'consuming fire,' who "visits the sins of the fathers upon the children, even to the third and fourth generation." The blessings promised to the obedient are indeed great, but the curses heaped upon the disobedient are even greater.<sup>2</sup> He has his glorious heaven and his burning hell, and Christian and Jew love and praise him when he is in his happy mood, and fear and dread him when he is in his angry mood. "Rejoice in the Lord, praise him with harp: sing unto him with the psaltery and an instrument of ten strings," exhorts the Psalmist; and a few lines further on he says: "Let all the earth fear the Lord; let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of him." This is precisely what most religious people do; they rejoice in the Lord, but they also stand in awe of him. The two emotions, love and fear, are correlative and opposite, just as heat and cold, light and darkness, good and evil, etc., and an excess of one expels the other. One of the best studies of fear from the point of view of its influence on the lives and actions of men is that of Pres. Hall.<sup>3</sup>

The following summary, taken from his article will, it is believed, be of interest to the reader. In reply to his questionnaire 1,701 per-

<sup>1</sup>M. D. Conway: *Demonolatry and Folklore*, Vol. 1, p. 14.

<sup>2</sup>*Cf.* Deut. 27, and Lev. 21: 21 *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup>*Amer. Jour. of Psy.*, Vol. 8, No. 2.

sons answered, describing 6,456 fears, which he groups according to the objects feared, as follows:

CELESTIAL PHENOMENA.		ANIMALS.	
Thunder and lightning,	603	Reptiles,	483
High wind,	143	Domestic animals,	268
Cyclones,	67	Wild animals,	206
Clouds and their forms,	44	Insects,	203
Meteors,	34	Rats and mice,	196
Northern lights,	25	Cats and dogs,	79
Comets,	18	Birds,	51
			<hr/>
			1,486
Fog,	16		
Storms,	14		
Eclipses,	14	Fire,	365
Extreme hot water,	10	Water,	205
Extreme cold water,	8	Drowning,	57
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	996		627
Darkness,	432	Strange persons,	437
Ghosts,	203	Robbers,	153
			<hr/>
Dream fears,	109		589
Solitude,	55		
	<hr/>		
	799	Death,	299
		Disease,	241
			<hr/>
			540

“This accounts for 5,037 fears, leaving 1,419 directed to many scores of objects to be discussed later. It would appear that thunderstorms are feared most, that reptiles follow, with strangers and darkness as close seconds, while fire, death, domestic animals, diseases, wild animals, water, ghosts, insects, rats, and mice, robbers, high winds, dream fears, cats and dogs, cyclones, solitude, drowning, birds, etc., represent decreasing degrees of fearfulness. When we specify reptiles, domestic animals, insects, birds, the kinds of disease, strangers,



dream fears, and add miscellaneous fears, we have in all 298 objects feared."

Here we have 298 objects feared by normal children, living in a relatively highly civilized and organized society, under the most favorable and protected conditions. The query naturally arises, how much larger the catalogue would be, and how much more intense the fears of primitive man (an adult child) who roamed about the primeval forests almost wholly unprotected from the forces of nature, and the animals about him, and to whom all natural phenomena appeared more or less mysterious and therefore terrible? The answer is readily found in the many demonolatries, and the countless demons of primitive peoples. Hunger, disease, death, dreams, darkness, ghosts, heat, cold, the elements, animals, insects, worms, trees and plants, and even inanimate objects have at one time or another been demonized and made the objects of religious worship.

What fear has meant in religion, even the highest forms of it, can be seen from the fact that no less than 518 references are made to it in the Old and New Testaments. We shall later on speak a little more fully concerning its influence on the religions of primitive and ancient peoples.

Like pity, fear is an emotion which men like Nietzsche, Ibsen, Wilde, and others regard as base and slavish. They have nothing but contempt for it and would eliminate it entirely from the soul of man. But how much smaller our lives would be were this done can be seen from Pres. Hall's study. Indeed, it would be almost as disastrous as the loss of one of our faculties. Fear is in a large sense the beginning of wisdom and prudence. "Never is the child's charm in an object," writes Pres. Hall, "so great as at the moment when he is just getting the better of his fear of it. One of the chief spurs to knowledge and science is to overcome fear, and many of the things now best known are those that used to be most feared. To feel a given fear no longer over but beneath us gives an exquisite joy of growth."<sup>1</sup> Fear is the result of the experiences of the race, and in a moderate degree is a means of protection. The pedagogic problem here as with pity and anger is not to eliminate the emotion, but to "gauge it to the power of proper reaction," to learn, in the words of Aristotle, "to fear in due proportion those things worthy of being feared."

<sup>1</sup> *Loc. cit.*

*Morbid Fears.*

If, as has been said, the total absence of fear is a deplorable deficiency, an excess of it is still more distressing and alienating. We need only mention the following morbid fears, and will at once appear how widespread its baneful influence may become :

- Agrophobia, or fear of open spaces ;
- Claustrophobia, or fear of enclosed spaces ;
- Clitrophobia, or fear of enclosed spaces ;
- Topophobia, or fear of all spaces or space ;
- Astrophobia, or fear of lightning ;
- Anthropophobia, or fear of crowds ;
- Monophobia, or fear of solitude ;
- Panphobia, or fear of everything ;
- Misophobia, or fear of dirt ;
- Vokophobia, or fear to return home ;
- Hypsophobia, or fear of heights ;
- Botophobia, or fear of cellars.<sup>1</sup>

To these we may add Theophobia and Peccatiphobia, the fear of God and the fear of sinning which become genuine obsessions among very many religionists.

The cultured modern attributes his pleasures and successes, his sufferings and reverses, to natural causes, even though he be unable to say what these causes are. But these are by no means true of all moderns. The late assassination of our President, for instance, the Galveston flood, Baltimore fire, the Iroquois and Slocum disasters, and all national calamities are still looked upon by the masses as the punishments of God for national or local sins. Now this is precisely the belief of primitive, barbarous, and uncivilized men the world over. To them natural causes, in the scientific sense of the word, are, of course, unknown—the joys of life spring from the blessings of a benevolent god, its misfortunes from curses of an angry deity who has been neglected or sinned against, or else the work of a demon who takes a fiendish delight in the sufferings of man. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the peoples whose environments were unfavorable, and whose struggle for existence was therefore especially severe should have centered their thoughts upon the evil side of their deities, or upon

<sup>1</sup> Kovalewsky: Folie du doute, Jour. Mental Science, 1887.



deities wholly evil, and exhausted their intellectual resources in endeavoring to propitiate them and gain their favor.

Again, whenever a people have strayed for some time from what happens to be considered the straight and narrow path of religion and morality, there is always an Elijah who in thundering and threatening words commands them to halt ere they rush headlong into the yawning pits of hell; who wakes them to a lively realization of their sinful and dangerous condition; points the way back, and if needs be, lashes and frightens them into it.

The best examples of this in modern times are the Great Awakening of 1740 which swept tornado-like over New England and left thousands of mental and physical wrecks in its train, and the Kentucky Revival which spread over several adjoining States and gave birth to such pathological phenomena as jerking, barking, jumping, ranting, uncontrollable laughing and shrieking, and other hysterical and convulsive performances.<sup>1</sup> To a less marked degree some of these phenomena are still to be seen in the revival meetings of Southern negroes and those conducted by Rev. E. Payson Hammond for little children.<sup>2</sup>

Among primitive and ancient peoples fear was, of course, the most overstimulated of all the emotions and demanded for its satisfaction nothing less than human sacrifices, often the noblest youths and virgins. This custom prevailed among almost all the peoples of the earth and persisted among a few for several centuries after the Christian era. Among the Khonds of Orissa, one of the ancient kingdoms of Hindustan, the custom was in vogue up to the year 1836, when it was suppressed by the British Government. In 1866 a terrible public sacrifice took place in Dahomey in which the king had 200 victims slaughtered in order to win the favor of the gods in the war which he was about to wage against the Aschantis. This was the third atrocity of the kind in the same year. In Kumassi there is a place said to be always wet with human blood. But the highest water-mark was reached by the Aztecs on whose altars between twenty and fifty thousand victims were yearly immolated.

The above consideration of the pathological effects resulting from

<sup>1</sup>For full accounts of these movements see Tracy, *The Great Awakening*, S. P. Hayes: *An Historical Study of the Edwardean Revivals*, *Amer. Jour. Psy.*, Vol. 13, pp. 550-574. F. M. Davenport: *Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals*, N. Y., 1905.

<sup>2</sup>See his two books, *Early Conversion*, and *Conversion of Children*.

an abnormal relation of the different emotions to the total religious experience justifies, in the opinion of the writer, the following generalizations.

First. Religion, like all other human products, such as art, science, philosophy, government, etc., is subject to the laws of evolution and degeneration, and is modified and colored by the general state of mental and physical health and degree of development of the individuals composing a tribe or race. Different types of individuals and different eras must of necessity give birth to different types of religion. God or nature has created a variety of types of individuals and each type has created a God in its own image.

Second. The religion of a people can never rise above its source, *i. e.*, the stage of their mental and moral development. The religion of a religious genius, though it may be accepted by the masses is rarely, if ever, their own religion in the truest sense of the word. Our meaning will be made clear when we say that after a lapse of twenty centuries of unparalleled development there are but few Christians even to-day. Also the difference between the Christianity of the third century and of the twentieth is proportional to the difference in the mental and moral development of the two centuries. Likewise, the religion of the savage and of the child of civilized parents is and always must be inferior to that of the cultured adult. It is as impossible to make them suddenly rise to the heights of a religion which has taken the most progressive nations centuries upon centuries to evolve as it is to hasten the growth of a tree by pulling it up. All attempts to do so have proven most injurious to the mental and physical health of the savage and the child. The true pedagogical method, so long ago recognized and put in use by the Buddhists and the first great and successful missionary, St. Paul<sup>1</sup> is, it is encouraging to note, at last being more and more appreciated by our own religious teachers and missionaries, who are now endeavoring to teach the child and the primitive peoples religions which they can understand and readily assimilate, religions which fit their stages of development and satisfy their needs.

Third. Arrested peoples have naturally enough arrested forms of religion. These religions cannot be called superstitions because superstitions as we understand them are unknown to these peoples. Their

<sup>1</sup>See 1 Cor. 3: 1-2.



beliefs and practices, absurd and childish as they seem to us, are congruous with their stage of development and are as truly religious as are those of more advanced peoples. Unless they injure the mental, moral, and physical health of their adherents they cannot be considered pathological. But when these same beliefs and customs persist among a people who have reached a stage of development which is not compatible with them, they become, like rudimentary organs, useless and dangerous.

Fourth. We have seen to what a large extent religion draws upon the emotions. Indeed, in the light of what has preceded we have no hesitancy in saying with Jonathan Edwards that true religion consists so much in the affections that there can be no true religion without them. One may be a philosopher, critic, and even a theologian and still be non-religious; and on the other hand he may be none of these to any marked degree and be extremely religious. "And though I have the gift of prophecy," says Paul, "and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity (love, kindness, sympathy, pity, etc.), I am nothing."<sup>1</sup> At least, so far as religion is concerned. It is "out of his strongest feelings," as Mr. Fielding writes, that "man has built up his faiths," and a cold, intellectual religion is an anomaly.<sup>2</sup>

Fifth. While the emotions are a prime essential of religion, as rivers are of fruitful valleys, and while in every normal religious consciousness each has its own proper and harmonious expression, the most disastrous results follow when any of them is inordinately exaggerated and intensified, whenever the river, so to speak, overflows its banks and spreads over alien areas. The danger here is especially great because of the close connection between the emotions and bodily states. It is impossible, of course, to determine with mathematical accuracy beyond what point the expression of an emotion becomes abnormal; the gradations from the normal to the abnormal are imperceptible. In the above cases, however, there can be no doubt that the phenomena are positively pathological, for in every instance the intellectual, moral, or physical developments of the individual, the tribe, or the race has been seriously interfered with.

Lastly, we have seen the close relationship between the emotions

<sup>1</sup> I Cor. 3:1-2.

<sup>2</sup> *The Hearts of Men*, p. 308.

and conduct. Disordered religious emotions lead to grotesque and pathological deeds, and *vice versa*. Man is an organic being, no part of which can be injured or deranged without its influencing other parts and the whole. In religion, as in all things, 'sophrosune' or the harmonious subordination of the parts to the whole is the healthy and normal condition to be striven for. Modern education, secular as well as religious, has still much to learn from the ancient Greeks who considered this the foundation of every virtue, and its mission will never be fulfilled until it has taught men to be temperate in all things. For the temperate man is preëminently the normal man; in his soul and body divine harmony reigns. He is healthy and happy, moral, religious, and worldly, and for him are the Kingdoms of Heaven and Earth.

*Note.* This paper is a condensation of the first chapter of a work which is almost ready for publication. In the succeeding chapters the following topics are treated.

Chap. 2. Mysticism, containing an account of the different and conflicting definitions of it; a brief historical survey from the earliest times to the present; an attempt to analyze it psychologically and to differentiate between normal mysticism which favors culture and self-expansion, and morbid mysticism which is either the product of a diseased brain, or when artificially induced leads to morbid introspection, idle contemplation, abstraction, trances, hallucinations, and other mental disturbances.

Chap. 3. Fetichism, Symbolism, and Interpretation. Here the writer attempts to show that symbols are necessary and useful to certain stages of development, but as soon as they cease to be symbols and become fetiches, idols, amulets, and hollow masks they are serious obstacles to intellectual progress. The long and bitter warfare waged by science against sacred relics supposed to possess miraculous curative powers; the many degenerate symbolic rites, the slightest violation of which had to be atoned for with most painful penances; the ceaseless turning of praying-wheels and cylinders by the Buddhists of Thibet; the countless repetitions of certain phrases by Catholics and Jews; the many injurious water and fire baptismal rites; the foul and revolting scatological rites are all examples of the injurious effects of morbid symbolism. In the Talmud, Quabbalah, and writings of the early and mediæval Christian Fathers we see the evils of bibliolatry, traditional-



ism, formalism, and the different kinds of interpretation such as the allegorical, tropological, anagogical, historical, etc. The intellectual energies of the best minds were for centuries wasted on these trivialities and undoubtedly retarded the progress of civilization.

Chap. 4. Asceticism and Monasticism. Here we show that asceticism obtains in almost all religions and attempt to differentiate, with the aid of illustrations, between normal asceticism, which is necessary for serious work of a high order, and morbid asceticism which drives men into deserts, marshes, caves, on pillar-tops, into narrow cells, or worse still into the unhealthy ooze of their morbid souls and is productive of nothing but disease, mental, moral, and physical. A psychological consideration of asceticism and its causes ends the chapter.

Chap. 5. The Intellectual Element in Religion. In this chapter we attempt to show the rôle of belief in religion and to discriminate between normal and necessary beliefs and those which militate against the advancement of science. Atavistic beliefs are pathological. In the same way we attempt to distinguish between normal doubt which spurs the intellect on to free itself from the errors of the past and extend the boundaries of knowledge, 'dubito ut intelligam' and morbid doubt, *folie du doute*, *Grübelsucht*, the only fruits of which are melancholia, despair, and suicide. Pedagogic principles which the study seems to warrant are deduced.

Chap. 6. The Volitional Element in Religion. Here we consider the rôle that will plays in religious consciousness; the relations between the emotions, intellect, and will. Those pathological religious acts and practices which could not well be included in the preceding chapters are here considered. A study of fanaticism and excessive church organization ends the book.

## SOME PSYCHOLOGICAL ELEMENTS IN FAMOUS SUPERSTITIONS.

BY REV. CHARLES FREDERICK ROBINSON, A. M., S. T. B.

The attention paid in recent years to the subject of the Psychology of Religion has made it inevitable that inquiry would sooner or later develop regarding the Pathology of Religion. The prospectus of this magazine says: "That the religious nature has diseases both chronic and acute of its own, not only its history but many of its temporary manifestations abundantly show." Just what factors constitute such diseases will doubtless come out upon discussion. I surmise that one factor of no small importance which will attract attention will be the condition of health or unhealth in which human minds are found. Certainly history seems to indicate that the prevalence of certain nervous affections, coupled with the fears of man inspired by the dangers of his environment, have wrought out certain quasi religious systems which have gravely and injuriously affected the peace and health of society. Such are demonology, sorcery, magic, witchcraft, and spiritualism, which on closer examination reveal as their foundation certain abnormal mental states in a part of mankind. In studying them, one is almost tempted to discard their various names, finding in them indications of one self-consistent historical system. For such a system we have no adequate name, and must for the present rest content with the word superstition.

For the study of this whole subject, little material is available in English, except in scattered form. Prof. Alfred Lehmann, director of the psychophysical laboratory at the University of Copenhagen, has gathered much important material together into a book on Superstition and Sorcery, which has been translated from the original Danish into German by Dr. Petersen as "*Aberglaube und Zauberei*." <sup>1</sup> Besides an invaluable discussion of every phase of the subject, Prof. Lehmann

<sup>1</sup> Stuttgart, 1898.



adds an exhaustive bibliography. To this should be added Soldan's monumental book on Witch-craft Trials, which has been brought down to recent date by his son-in-law Heinrich Heppe.<sup>1</sup>

A study of the influence of the abnormal on religious thought as suggested by these and other books, cannot but convince the sober reader of the necessity for emphasizing the normal and healthy religious experience as true to the human constitution, and hence true to God in whose image man is made. Certainly the experience of the race in the past gives overwhelming evidence of the degrading influence of the terror-inspiring illusions that have always accompanied the abnormal in religion.

The origins of systems containing such features might be traced back into the thought of savage peoples. It will, however, be sufficient for our purpose to begin with the ancient peoples who dwelt in the Euphrates valley. At the dawn of history, we find their religious system highly developed, showing many features that foreshadow the later Hebrew ideas. Compare with the Fifty-first Psalm, these extracts from a Babylonian penitential psalm.<sup>2</sup>

"O my god, who art angry with me,  
accept my prayer!  
O my goddess, who art wroth with me,  
receive my supplication!  
Receive my supplication, let thy liver be  
at rest!  
. . . . .  
May the ban be loosened, may the chains  
be cast off!  
May the seven winds carry away my sighs!  
May I strip off my wickedness, may the  
birds carry it to the heavens!  
May the fish carry off my misery,  
the river bear it away!  
May the beasts of the field take it away from me,  
may the running waters of the river  
wash me clean!  
Make me bright like gold!"

This might almost be a Hebrew psalm, but for the modified view of nature; but now the tide turns, and the cankering desire to read the

<sup>1</sup>Soldan-Heppe: *Hexenprozesse*, Stuttgart, 1880.

<sup>2</sup>Biblical World, May, 1904, p. 364 f.

future through the unusual or striking dream appears,—the true Chaldean element:

“Grant to me that I may see a favorable  
dream!  
May the dream which I see be favorable,  
may the dream which I see come true!  
The dream which I see turn to  
my favor!  
May the god, . . . the god of dreams, stand  
at my head,  
Make me to enter into Esagila, the  
temple of the gods, the house of life!”

A most essential part of their religious system was the belief in the possession of every phase of nature's activities by lower spiritual powers, which may be called daemons. Such spirits, dwelling in every tree, rock, stream and hill, in the air and in the sea, had each its master word or formula, the possession of which gave a man the power to compel it to do his bidding. The knowledge of the proper formulæ with which to ward off the dangers and diseases brought on by evil spirits was the prerogative of the priests, who were busied much of the time in the work of exorcism. It even became necessary to make a division of labor, that all the work of this sort called for might be done. The priests were therefore usually specialists in the exorcism of some particular sort or family of evil spirits. It readily follows that there might be men and women who would seek the aid of these same evil spirits in order to harm those whom they hated. The code of Hammurabi shows that the very charge of such a thing was equal to a gage of mortal combat between accused and accuser, carrying with it the forfeiture of the estate of the vanquished.<sup>1</sup>

In spite of this provision of the law, the “Black Art,” alongside the “White Magic,” developed in great luxuriance in this centre of Oriental civilization, and from thence spread all over the known world. The very name “Chaldean” came to indicate some connection with occult powers. Forms of conjuring feared by these people were the mutilation of effigies, the evil face, the evil eye, the evil tongue, the evil lip, the shameful poison, and especially, the curse.

“The shameful curse, it works upon man like an evil demon; the words of the curse float over him. . . . It is the charm which causes

<sup>1</sup>Code of Hammurabi, § 2.

madness, . . . it strangles this man like a lamb; his god has withdrawn from the depths of his body.”<sup>1</sup>

The names of things with the master formulæ, in their thought, have a sort of identity with the things themselves, so that harming the name, harms the thing. This feeling, reversed, led parents to name the child for a god, that the god might protect him.

Another favorite study of the Chaldeans was an attempt to discover the connection between events on earth and the motions of the stars, which, with their belief in the spiritual possession of all things in nature, they identified with the gods. This study resulted in the so-called “science” of astrology, which has survived through the millenniums down to our day. They were also interested in different forms of augury by the actions of animals, flight of birds, etc.

However much the errors of the Chaldean system may be accounted for through faulty observation and a naïve philosophy, we cannot doubt that exorcism, at least, rested upon the existence among the people of such nerve diseases as epilepsy and insanity, which show phases in their symptoms that have almost universally caused observers to assume the presence of superhuman agencies. The discovery of the physiological basis for these diseases is a matter of comparatively recent date.

Another common belief was in witchcraft. The peasantry of old Akkad already believed that the witches gathered together for their obscene ceremonies, riding to the same on a “Stick of wood” (the modern broomstick).<sup>2</sup> I shall later attempt to show the origin of this ancient tradition in abnormal mental conditions and the use of a well-known narcotic.<sup>3</sup>

The Chaldeans also knew, apparently, of the trance state that is the basis of the capacity of spiritualistic mediums, and interpreted it, as has so often been done since, as an indication of the reality of the commerce of the living with the souls of the dead.

The complete demonology which resulted from these beliefs, brought to the West through many different channels, elevated into an occult “science” by the school-men, and spreading more obscurely among the common people, helped to incite the use of torture and the stake for

<sup>1</sup>Lehmann: *Aberglaube und Zauberei*, p. 32.

<sup>2</sup>Soldan: *Hexenprozesse*, 1, p. 20.

<sup>3</sup>The Chaldeans personified the images formed by erotic dreams as male and female demons whom they called “the night compellers, whose embraces neither man nor woman can avoid in sleep.” Lehmann: *op. cit.*, p. 26.



thousands of hysterical women accused of witchcraft, and persists to-day in our astrology, palmistry, and fast disappearing "Black art."

The development which was meantime going on in Egypt, led to a more clearly defined spiritualism, along with the universal belief in demoniacal possession. The peculiarity of Egyptian religion was the power assumed in their magic formulas and charms, to force the god to do their bidding. This so-called theurgy rested on the theory that even the gods have their weak sides, from which one skilled in magic can approach to compel favors. This, too, had its influence upon the learned magic of the Middle Ages.<sup>1</sup>

The early Greeks saw in nature the presence of localized spirits inhabiting forests, fountains, and trees—nymphs, dryads, satyrs. But these spirits had no ill will to men. The Greek mind was not favorable to exorcism. The help of one god or goddess was directly invoked to ward off the injury which another might try to work. Yet the prevalence of superstition among the common people is shown by the customs of the *anthesteria*, an Athenian festival, where the offerings were to the god of the under world, and the celebrators were prepared at all times for a sudden appearance of the shades of the departed. Doorposts were daubed with pitch to ward off the dreaded ghosts, and food was set forth for them, that they might be appeased from any harmful intentions.<sup>2</sup>

The early Greek acquaintance with spiritualism is shown by the Homeric poems. The proceedings of Ulysses on the Cimmerian shores show how the various acts of sacrifice tended to produce in the celebrator that abstraction and enthusiasm that leads to the partial self-hypnotization of the "medium:"

"The blood flowed dark; and thronging round me came  
Souls of the dead from Erebus—young wives  
And maids unwedded, men worn out with years  
And toil, and virgins of a tender age  
In their new grief, and many a warrior slain  
In battle, mangled by the spear, and clad  
In bloody armor, who about the trench  
Flitted on every side, now here, now there,  
With gibbering cries, and I grew pale with fear."<sup>3</sup>

The story of Orpheus and Eurydice is another case in point.

<sup>1</sup> Lehmann: *op. cit.*, pp. 130 f. 212.

<sup>2</sup> Ency. Brit., 2, 103. Lehmann: *op. cit.*, p. 43.

<sup>3</sup> Bryant's *Odyssey*, Book 11, ll. 46-51, *cf.* the preceding lines.

Curiously enough, the two famous oracles of Greece, at Delphi and Dodona, both depended upon the abnormal mental condition of the priestesses who delivered the words of the god. This was well understood by the Greeks themselves, who regarded the abstraction or ecstasy in which they spoke as the direct possession of the priestess by the god Apollo, or Zeus, as the case might be. But modern criticism furnishes the physiological basis by showing that the Delphic oracle was doubtless "inspired" by some kind of natural gas proceeding from a hole in the rock, and that the priestess at Dodona was intoxicated with the water of a mineral spring.<sup>1</sup>

Greece also made her contribution to the witchcraft tradition. This form of belief probably entered the land through Thessaly, which was long occupied by the Persians. Additions to the original demonology from the Greek mythology, and from other sources in the West, caused the later blossoming of a complete imaginary system of witchcraft, or league with the devil for evil purposes of enchantment and ghoulish revelry. It is already a fixed idea of this offspring of man's diseased imagination, that the Thessalian women who indulged in it could fly about in the air on their lustful errands.<sup>2</sup> They possessed the power of making an ointment—another fixed element in the tradition,—that would turn a man into a bird, an ass, or a stone. The ingredients of this ointment are fish entrails, lizards, wolf's hairs, toad's bones, dove's blood, snake's skeletons, owl's feathers, remains of the dead, and other disgusting objects. The use of this ointment points us, as we shall see later, to the use of a narcotic to heighten certain visions of a hysterical nature which, by their erotic form, produced the impression of a system of immoral orgies by night. The diabolical person with whom the Thessalian witches had commerce was the goddess of the under world, the fearful Hecate, who appears in the thickest darkness with torch and sword, with dragon feet and serpent hair, surrounded by bay-ing hounds, and followed by fearful phantoms. All the accompaniments of the scene, with its vague and shadowy nature, speak of the nightmare that follows digestive abuse, or the wreck of the nervous system through sexual excesses. So great was the reputation of the witches of

<sup>1</sup> Myers: *The Eastern Nations and Greece*, p. 179, *Ency. Brit.*, 7: p. 53; Lehmann: *op. cit.*, p. 48.

<sup>2</sup> Soldan: *Hexenprozesse* 1, p. 42 ff. Lehmann: *op. cit.*, p. 50 ff.

Thessaly, that in Horace's time the people of Naples believed they could call the moon down out of the sky.<sup>1</sup>

The Roman magic, spiritualism and witchcraft differed little in essentials from the Greek. Augury was more prominent, probably as a result of contact with the Etruscans, who were evidently closely related with the peoples of the East, and preserved the old forms of divination through the inspection of the entrails of sacrificed animals. Rome also had its oracle, the Sibylline priestess at Cumae. The appearance of the Sibyl is described by Vergil.<sup>2</sup> When the inspiration of the god comes over the prophetess, she changes color, tears her hair, breathes irregularly, and passes into a frenzy, appearing more majestic than mortals, as if under a divine afflation, drawing nearer to the god. In this semi-trance condition she writes prophecies on leaves of trees, which she lays in order, but which the wind disorders.

The Roman belief in witchcraft gives us the description of creatures called "*Striges*," "*Empusae*," and "*Lamiae*," nightmare-like beasts who were supposed to offer their breasts to children to poison them with their unwholesome milk, or, according to others, to suck out their blood and vitals. These creatures were once supposed to have feathers, to lay eggs, etc., but later they were identified with women who transformed themselves into feathered creatures to fly through the air on their quests.<sup>3</sup>

One can hardly look back upon these ancient systems of belief, without noting the profound influence upon men's thought of dreams, visions, trances, and the morbid conditions brought on by mental disease and the use of narcotics. Since these phenomena were striking and unusual, they caught people's attention, and held it more completely than normal conditions could. Yet, since they often resulted in evil, they were more naturally ascribed to demons than to a good God. Hence arose a complete demonology, a considerably definite spiritualism, and a peculiar system of witchcraft.

The early Christians believed that their great adversary was overcome through the power of Christ,<sup>4</sup> and, that the power had been given to the missionaries of the new religion to cast out his lesser followers from those whom they afflicted.

<sup>1</sup> Horace: Epode 5, ll. 43-46.

<sup>2</sup> Æneid: 3, ll. 441 ff., 6, ll. 45-51.

<sup>3</sup> Ovid: Fast., 6: 141.

<sup>4</sup> I John, 3:8.



They walked through the world without fear of ghosts or witches or even of the devil himself. Their belief in Christ, had, for the first time in the world's history, completely freed men from fear of the threat of unseen harm.<sup>1</sup> In Genesis 6:1-4, they found a basis for belief in the reality and activity of devils, who raged against the kingdom of Christ, stirred up the heathen to persecute the church, fomented heresies in it, wrought injury upon men and flocks through famine and plague, though their power to injure the Christian himself was forever broken.<sup>2</sup> Augustine (d. 430) taught that God created two kingdoms in the world, the *civitas Dei*, and the *civitas Diaboli*, the latter not yet overcome though closely besieged by the church. Since the devils, light in body, could do wonderful things, men worshipped them as gods, and thus originated the heathen religious systems. Even Augustine admitted the reality of the world of demons, though its power was destroyed by Christ. The singing of incantations and the wearing of amulets was strictly forbidden to the Christian as counting on the aid of devils.

The earliest Christian laws drastically forbade all forms of magic, naming auspices, augurs, "Chaldeans," magicians, invokers of the dead, interpreters of dreams and all prophets.<sup>3</sup>

In spite of this liberation of the early Christians, the Middle Ages saw a great development of superstition following several different courses. One of them was influenced by the contact of Western scholars with the Arabs and Moors, and took the form of a pseudo-science, called the "Learned Magic." The Jewish mysticism also enters here, and adds its Kabbalistic learning, with its secret codes, and its belief in the place of the letter and the number in the search after divine wisdom as manifested in the world.

The divisions of the learned magic follow the means through which the scholar hopes to penetrate the secrets of nature and of human life. Thus we have astrology, which thinks of the stars as having special sympathy with mundane persons and events; chiromancy, the sympathy of the wrinkles of the hands with the fate of the individual; the practical Kabbalah, or search for keywords of angels and devils; alchemy, the study of means to transmute baser metals into gold;

<sup>1</sup> Cf. The Shepherd of Hermas, 8:8, 12:4, 6.

<sup>2</sup> Soldan: Hexenprozesse. 1 pp. 86 ff. <sup>3</sup> Cod. Theod. Lib. 9, Tit. 16. 1. 4, 5, 6.

natural magic, the "science" of the sympathy and antipathy of things in nature.

During and since the Middle Ages the vogue of this branch of superstition has encouraged in the popular mind a tendency to believe in the possibility of special occult knowledge and power. In the life of the church, both priests and laymen have come to regard the ordinary ministrations of the clergy as endowed with a supernatural—indeed, practically a magic—efficiency. The Catholic church emerged from the Middle Ages firmly established in several doctrines that partook of this superstitious character. Such is the doctrine of transubstantiation, which holds that at the tinkling of the altar bell that which has been the bread and wine actually becomes the body and blood of Christ, and is to be revered as such.<sup>1</sup> One may sometimes read in his morning paper, of a priest rushing through fire and smoke, at the risk of his own life, to save the consecrated host from the flames. The mass is practically an incantation, the priest a sorcerer, and the magic the mightiest ever known, the changing of the simplest elements of daily use into the body of God. When this magic is administered on the death bed, it assures one of a share in eternal joy.

Such another doctrine is that of the priestly power of absolution, in which the priest, entirely independently of any character element involved, declares that the penitent's sins are forgiven. Indeed, the whole so-called sacramentarian system of thought, which regards the sacraments as having their effect independently of the state of mind of the recipient, and of the character of the officiating priest is essentially based upon a view of religion as magic. "The sacraments produce their legitimate effect *ex opere operato*, that is, by an intrinsic efficiency."<sup>2</sup> With such views as these, it is natural to expect the sale of indulgences, and the Jesuitical belief and practice of deception to gain holy ends.

The learned magic also joined with the popular tradition in giving a fresh impetus to the ancient system of witchcraft. The best witness to this is the Faust legend. The Faust of Goethe, and the older Faust of Marlowe, is a scholar who has tried and tired of all forms of learning, and has finally turned to magic books where "Lines, circles, scenes, letters and characters,"<sup>3</sup> upon the pages, unfold to the sorcerer

<sup>1</sup> Fisher: History of the Christian Church, pp. 179, 225.

<sup>2</sup> Fisher: *op. cit.*, p. 223 f.

<sup>3</sup> Marlowe's Faustus, Act 1, Scene 1.

“A world of profit and delight,  
Of power, of honor, of omnipotence.”

Using the charm which he finds in the magic book, he finds to his surprise that the spirit he calls appears.<sup>1</sup> It is but a step from the obedience of the spirit to an agreement with the devil, by which the scholar sells his soul for the use of the devil's power to grant him a certain number of years of enjoying the satisfaction of his desires. It is easy to see that the first part of the legend concerns the learned magic, and the second reflects the vulgar view of witchcraft, the origin of which, as I have shown, is lost in the dim mists of antiquity.

In the early years of the Christian church the dominant pagans brought the accusation of evil practices against the rising sect of Christians. These depraved people, they say, at their love-feasts, shutting out all who have not joined them in most awe-inspiring vows, surfeit upon disgusting foods, prominent among which are young children stolen from their enemies, worship an ass or some other common beast, and, finally, extinguishing the lights, indulge in most foul orgies of promiscuous sexual excess. The prosecution of such foul creatures thus became a work of public necessity. When the church came into power, Christians speedily made the same accusations against the heretical sects. At the same time they transformed the gods of the old heathen mythologies into evil spirits with certain powers which could be made use of through magic art. Yet some of the leaders objected strenuously to this renewal of belief in demons. Chrysostom (d. 407) denied from his pulpit that charms, phylacteries, etc., had any power whatever, denouncing all belief in them as foolishness.<sup>2</sup> That his view of the matter gained great power in the church is shown by the so-called *Canon Episcopi*, long supposed to date from the Synod of Ancyra (A. D. 314) but now known to belong probably to the ninth century. Some quotations from it may be illuminating as to the status of witchcraft in the Christian church.<sup>3</sup>

“Some wicked women—led by illusions and phantasies of demoniacal origin—believe and profess that they, in the night, with Diana, a goddess of the pagans, or with Herodias and an innumerable company

<sup>1</sup> Marlowe's *Faustus*, Act 1, Scene 3. Goethe's *Faust*, Act 1, Scene 1.

<sup>2</sup> Chrysostom, on Adornments of Women, also 30th Homily on Matthew.

<sup>3</sup> Soldan: *Hexenprozesse*, 1, p. 130 ff.



of women, ride upon certain beasts over great stretches of territory in the silence of the stormy night, and obey her orders as if she were the Lord, and on certain nights are called out to worship her. A great multitude of people, deceived by this false opinion, believe these things are true, and by so believing, wander from the true faith, and are involved in the errors of the pagans in believing that there is any divinity or superhuman power except the one God. . . . Satan himself when he has captivated the mind of any woman . . . transforms himself into the appearance and likeness of various persons, and affecting in sleep the mind which he holds captive now joyfully, now sadly, and showing it persons, now known, now unknown, leads it through devious ways; and while the spirit alone experiences this, the faithless mind thinks it has happened not to the soul, but to the body. For who is there who is not led outside himself in dreams and visions of the night, and who does not see many things while asleep that he has never seen while awake? . . . Therefore whoever believes it can be brought about that any creature can be changed either into a better or worse, or transformed into another likeness or similitude except by the Creator himself who made all things and through whom all things are made, without doubt is an infidel and worse than a pagan."

This eminently sane conclusion might have held its ground, had not influences favorable to superstition set in with the ending of the first Christian millenium, which did not, as expected, mark the end of the world. The Crusades appealed to the imaginations of men with new things to be afraid of, coming out of the East. The Saracens became the instructors of the Franks in mystic and magic arts. Great wars and pestilences kept men in a state of almost constant panic. Force ruled, and lust ran riot. The times were ripe for great epidemics of nervous affections of a hysterical nature, when the dream-visions mentioned in the *Canon Episcopi* would take on unusually vivid form, and the impressible minds of women would be open to the faintest suggestions of what it might be possible for them to experience in the darkness of the stormy night. Learned men, too, were to play their part. Thomas Aquinas gave the death blow to the *Canon Episcopi* and established about 1265 the contrary thesis;<sup>1</sup> that he who did not believe witchcraft possible was wandering from the faith, and worthy of excommunication.

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Aquinas: Quodlib. 11 Art. 10. See Soldan: Hexenprozesse, 1, p. 142 f.

It needed only the zeal of the inquisitors, on the watch for every fall from the holy Catholic faith, to persuade a narrow-minded pope to issue a bull<sup>1</sup> commanding all the clergy to assist the inquisition in searching out and punishing witchcraft, to set in motion all the machinery of the church against those regarded as witches. The opportunity was used by the Inquisition with all its well known merciless ingenuity in the art of torture, for over a century. Thousands were burned at the stake. In some provinces, whole villages were desolated; the mere accusation of witchcraft usually being sufficient to lead to an execution.

The judicial records of the "trials" of these witches, reveals a supposed system of debased worship having a universal nature that points to some common cause. The witches were said to go forth by night to worship the devil, by whom they had first been seduced, and afterward bound to himself by some fearful covenant. They practiced unnamable obscenities, mocked the rites of the church by foul imitations, and indulged in promiscuous lustful orgies. The devil revealed to them charms by which they could injure the person, the cattle, or the fields of their enemies. They anointed themselves with a narcotic ointment, and flew to the scene of the gathering on a broomstick or a black cat. The gatherings were held, when possible, on some high festival day of the church. The witches who were examined were ready to name their companions, who in turn were likely to make confession. In fact the most puzzling feature of the witchcraft trials, is that the whole disgusting system is apparently wrought out by the "confessions" of the accused—confessions, of course, wrung out by torture, or by fear of torture.

The existence of this system in the thought of men is one of the riddles of history. Its main features are very ancient, and of such a universal nature that they cannot be the result of individual fancy. It can only be the result of certain constant psychical elements, which it is our task to discover. Historically, we have to note the extreme antiquity of the superstition and its connection with the Chaldean demonology; the natural fear of the night and its dangers on the part of sensitive women; the heartrending scenes of persecution in the early days of Christianity; the contact of the West with the mystical

<sup>1</sup> Bull of Innocent VIII, A. D. 1484.

East in the Crusades ; and the rigorous divisions brought about by the Reformation.<sup>1</sup> Psychologically, we note certain abnormal phases of experience which furnish the constant elements for which we seek, and determine the character of the tradition. They are :—(a) dreams and visions of the night, the prevailing erotic character of which show their connection with hysteria, heightened, no doubt, by the narcotic *Solanum furiosum* or *Hyoscyamus niger* used in the witch-ointment<sup>2</sup> so prevalently in evidence ; (b) the working on the suggestibility of the already existing body of tradition in giving form to the dreams, and confirming the vague impressions of them as remembered in the waking hours ; (c) the terror of the torture rack and the confusing accusations and cross-questioning of the inquisitors, suggesting things from previous confessions made to them, the very horror of which would naturally prove a fascination to the half-frantic mind of the accused, and in which it is easier to read the wish of the torturer than the actual experience of the tortured ; (d) along with these elements we gain hints of the existence and occasional manifestation of the phenomena that accompany the spiritualistic “medium.”

Thus the pitiful system was built up out of shattered nerves, from superstition, and the fear that follows persecution. In spite of our boasted progress, we may expect to see any day in our morning paper of the breaking out of the old superstition in some remote district of Europe, culminating in an attempted execution of some unfortunate woman.

The religious result of this system was the substitution for the one God of two mighty beings, one rather colorless, though theoretically the All-powerful, and the other a very interesting and terrible being, with much power to harm men, whom they called the devil. Nothing could prove a more effectual counter belief to the Christian's trust in the love and mercy of God.

Upon the death of witchcraft, spiritualism arose with its new demonology to fill the void. The demons were replaced by spirits with all the power of their predecessors, but without their malice. The key to the whole system of spiritualism is in the one psychical peculi-

<sup>1</sup> A Romish bishop in 1565 declared Martin Luther to be the actual child of the devil. Soldan: *Hexenprozesse*. 1, p. 308.

<sup>2</sup> Lehman: *op. cit.*, p. 504 f.



arity of individuals which results in the noteworthy phenomena in connection with their presence that characterize the so-called "medium."<sup>1</sup> That these phenomena are caused by disembodied spirits is only one of several possible interpretations.

Historically considered, spiritualism is of very ancient origin.<sup>2</sup> Frequent references to mediumistic phenomena are found in the records of witchcraft trials. A typical case occurred in the house of one Anna Bartskjärs in 1608-9. The "medium" in this case was a boy of twelve. The phenomena noted were clucking as of a hen with chickens under the head of the bed; then a sudden seizure of the boy while he lay in bed, accompanied by a violent rocking of the bedstead. He was made temporarily dumb by the seizure. The next evening while the family were at supper, both doors were flung violently open without visible agency, and the boy lifted suddenly an ell and a half into the air, resisting the force of the united family who tried to pull him down. Upon their falling on their knees in prayer to God, he fell back to the floor.<sup>3</sup> Here we have spirit rappings, trance, and levitation, ascribed here to witchcraft, as later to the agency of spirits.

The learned magic knew of the power to call up spirits, which were called demons rather than the souls of the dead. Abraham of Worms tells how to develop what would now be called mediumistic powers through prayer and contemplation, and promises a "materialization" as the result.<sup>4</sup> The roots of spiritualism are thus seen to be in the old demonology. The difference is mainly in the direction taken by the hints to the suggestibility of those affected.

Swedenborg (1688-1772), while knowing nothing of spirit rappings, was subject to visions, and possessed the power of clairvoyance, which he ascribed to the ministration of spirits. His whole system of religious teaching rests upon the assumption that for many years he was in intimate converse with angels and with the spirits of the dead, of whose condition he gives most detailed descriptions.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For an excellent definition see Lehmann, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

<sup>2</sup> *Vide supra*, p. 251.

<sup>3</sup> Lehmann: *op. cit.*, p. 215, quoting from Anna Bartskjär's MSS., published by Brunsmand in 1674.

<sup>4</sup> In "On the True Practice of the Ancient and Divine Magic," apparently of the 17th century.

<sup>5</sup> See Swedenborg: *Heaven and Hell*, *Sub fine.*; *The True Christian Religion*, Nos. 792-851, also *Index to the Relations*; *The Heavenly Arcana*, Nos. 320-323, 443-459; also White: *Life of Emanuel Swedenborg*, chs. 8 and 9.

In the first quarter of the nineteenth century, several German savants, following Swedenborg, built up a system of Pneumatology which developed still further the spiritualistic teaching. They were favored with the services of one of the most renowned mediums of modern times, Frederika Hauffe, the "Seeress of Prevorst." Her powers were developed along with severe nervous disturbances of a hysterical order, which were treated by a magnetic healer. The sad wreck of her bodily strength left her in a state of almost constant somnambulism in which she was clairvoyant and saw spirits. Physical phenomena, such as the opening and shutting of a door, a musical tone formed in the air, etc., also took place in her presence. She produced automatic writing and enjoyed great renown as a healing medium. She spoke often in a special language, which she called the language of the spirits. Her own interpretation of these phenomena was purely spiritualistic.

Certain happenings in two widely separated villages in America, about 1850, gave a great impetus to spiritualism as a system,—one almost says a religion. In Hydesville, a little hamlet of Wayne Co., New York, a house was visited by spirit rappings. The three Fox sisters, children, who soon after lived in the house, were the first to seek answers from the spirit world by a system of signals (three raps for yes, one for no, etc.). The "spirit" who answered them assured them that he was a pedlar who had been murdered in the house and buried in the cellar. On investigation a skeleton was indeed found. The phenomena was investigated by many people, including some scientific men, who declared a spiritualistic interpretation the only possible one. It should be added that the Fox sisters, later in life, confessed that they produced the knocking by a peculiar ability to snap their toe joints. Yet the psychological peculiarities of the "medium" were present, and it was their practice that originated table-tipping.

In Stratford, Conn., the "medium" was the eleven years old Harry Phelps, son of Rev. Dr. Phelps, a well-known clergyman. In his presence the furniture tumbled about in the most extraordinary manner, clothes gathered themselves together into the appearance of a human form, windows were broken, fires kindled, etc. These events were investigated by Andrew Jackson Davis, who, while confessing his discovery of certain elements of trickery, wrought out of them and his own experience a complete system of religious philosophy. Appearing

in his book "The Principles of Nature," and other works, this system became the theoretical basis of modern spiritualism. The especially popular feature of his teaching was the denial of any difference between good and wicked people except in development, the lack of which will be made up in the spirit existence.

The limits of this paper forbid a thoroughgoing discussion of these phenomena.<sup>1</sup> In general, they are of two classes, which may be called physical and psychical. The first class, if correctly observed, implies the existence of a force in nature, working through the brain or muscles of the medium, which is not in the category of scientifically known forces. For instance, Rev. Minot J. Savage claims to have seen with his own eyes a heavy piano raised into the air by the touch of a delicate woman's hand.<sup>2</sup> This he supposes to have been done by spirits. Similar phenomena claimed to have been observed are rappings, ringing of bells, playing of musical instruments without contact of any human hand, appearance of lights, sound of voices, appearance of human forms, direct writing without human intervention, handling of red hot coals, passing of solids through solids, etc. These have been explained as well by an occult force in nature, as by the agency of spirits; but neither assumption seems to be necessary. After an exhaustive inquiry into all forms of so-called physical forces, Lehmann concludes, "No intelligent investigator of to-day will deny *a priori* the possibility that there may be a still unknown force in man's nature. But one thing is certain: up to the present time no one has been able to give an irrefutable proof for the existence of such a force."<sup>3</sup> In the first place it must be noted that most of the noted "physical mediums" have been exposed in trickery and sleight of hand, part of which may indeed be below the level of consciousness, and so unintentional. In the second place, the impossibility of accurate observation<sup>4</sup> in the conditions of the usual séance, and the credulity of the average attendant, render most accounts of very doubtful scientific value. "What may broadly be called

<sup>1</sup> See Ency. Brit. "Spiritualism," and Lehmann, *Aberglaube und Zauberei*. pp. 211-312.

<sup>2</sup> In a book entitled "Can Telepathy Explain."

<sup>3</sup> Lehmann: *op. cit.*, p. 312.

<sup>4</sup> Lehmann personally succeeded in producing writing on the inside of a slate, and convincing two scientific men that it had been closed all the time. The three conflicting reports of what took place are exceedingly significant. *Op. cit.*, p. 345 ff.



conjuring is, however, a much more probable explanation of the recorded phenomena."<sup>1</sup>

The second class of phenomena have their convincing powers through the unusual actions and words of the medium, or may be explained by automatic vibratory movements of the hand in contact with such an object as a table, or even automatic writing—all these things usually being done or said by the medium in a state of trance. The form of these phenomena is clearly explained by recent psychological studies as the play of the sub-conscious imagination, and the control of the movements of the body by the lower nervous centres. Study of hypnotism, hysteria, double consciousness, etc., have thrown great light upon the mental states involved. The only real question now at issue is one of the contents of the medium's mind. Can sense perception account for the original acquisition of all the things that come automatically to the surface of the mind in the abnormal state of trance, or must we fall back upon one of the alternative theories of spiritual communication or telepathy, *i. e.*, direct communication between minds of living people?

The answer to this will depend partly upon one's own inclination. Lehmann says, "Among a thousand spiritualists scarcely one has seen with his own eyes what would have convinced him of the agency of spirits, if he had not brought the belief to the séance with him."<sup>2</sup>

Two comparatively recent discoveries have a vital bearing upon the question. One is that sensations may register their impression upon the memory which are never focal in consciousness until at some later time; then, while the attention is crippled by hypnotism or by some form of artificial abstraction, they spring forth as fresh as though first perceived.

A young woman who was wont to amuse herself with crystal-gazing, saw in the crystal one day, after a long walk, a house with a stone wall on which the jasmine grew in a peculiar and striking way. She was sure she had never seen the house or the jasmine. On the next day she retraced the walk of the day before, and found the house just as her crystal vision had shown it. It had been only marginal in her consciousness before, and had not attracted her attention in the least. Yet the record of it appeared in her memory. Similar mental posses-

<sup>1</sup> Ency. Brit., 22, p. 406.

<sup>2</sup> Lehmann: *op cit.*, p. 243.

sions of which the medium is unconscious, may play a large rôle in supposed revelations.

The second is that unconscious oral or whispered communications between persons in a peculiar state of rapport play a part hitherto hardly suspected. The study of unusual mental states through hypnotism shows a remarkable sharpening of the senses of the psychic to least sounds made by the hypnotizer. Nothing could exceed the completeness and elegance with which Lehmann has experimentally demonstrated the part this has in supposed telepathy as studied by the Society for Psychical Research. He placed two sound reflecting mirrors with their axes in the same line, in such a way that the mouth of one person could be placed in one focus, and the ear of a second person at the other. The first named person was then told to think steadily of some number. In spite of all efforts to restrain the movement of the organs of speech, a faint but definite whisper reached the ear of the second person, who then wrote down the number heard. A long series of numbers transmitted in this way showed such an astonishingly similar proportion of successes and failures, and such identical classes of mistakes, to those of Prof. and Mrs. Sidgwick, that it can safely be accepted as a demonstration that their supposed telepathy rested upon the same foundation, transmission of the sound of involuntary whispers, undoubtedly heard through a sense abnormally sharpened by a peculiar rapport resembling hypnotism.<sup>1</sup> This discovery at once gives the key to many otherwise unexplained phenomena of spiritualism and clairvoyance.

Sufficient has been said to show the connection of spiritualism with abnormal mental states. Indeed it rests upon such abnormality definitely in the theory and practice of its advocates. Only they believe it a mark of progress towards the state at which all men will ultimately arrive, while science sees in it evidence of mental disturbances from which all should be delivered.

The present state of popular belief show vestiges of all the ancient superstitions. Every newspaper has its long list of advertisements of astrologers, clairvoyants and mediums. Every farmer's almanac is full of forecasts of the weather based on astrology. I am gravely informed

<sup>1</sup> Lehmann: *op. cit.*, pp. 386 f.

that people always die on the ebb tide, and that the twelve days following Christmas are "observation days" for the coming year.

More cultivated people are eager over spiritualism, theosophy, and occultism, and gloat over the supposed secrets of the spirit world with a sort of half terrified delight. Plenty of books that pander to this appetite appear yearly, and are eagerly received. I note that the tendency of these superstitions is to give a stale appetite for the sweet commonplaces of life, and a positive distaste for the soberer phases of religious thought, and I recall that our Lord said, "Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will in no wise believe."<sup>1</sup>

Thousands are ready to follow new religious leaders, who base their appeal upon the desire for some special or striking phenomena,—notably faith-healing. We have but to mention healing mediums, Dowie, Sanford, and Mary Baker Eddy to emphasize this. Defective philosophy, bizarre practices, brazen claims, are eagerly swallowed, if instances can be shown of cures wrought by those who are praised as having "such sweet and lovely dispositions."

Now no one can deny that many diseases of a nervous nature can be cured if one can turn the mind of the patient from his own symptoms to a new course of thought and feeling. This is the truth upon which faith-healing has hit, but to which it has no right of monopoly.

Christian Science, the most notable of such systems, numbers its adherents by the hundreds of thousands all over the world. Few can be found to explain, much less inspire with life, its confused attempt at philosophy; yet since it uses the "cures" of abnormal mental states as a witness, and advances sweeping claims of ability to cure all disease in like manner,—in fact deny all disease—it makes its way easily among those whose constitution demands an element of wonder at the mysterious.

In the *Atlantic Monthly* for April, 1904, John W. Churchman has given a most thorough discussion of this latest superstition. He declares that their claims are as arbitrary as those of the ordinary quack doctors. "You may search the 'literature' through," he says, "but you will not find a single clinical history, not the record of one careful examination, nothing, from hark away to kill, beyond the 'I say so' of laymen and laywomen who could not tell a floating cartilage from a floating kidney, or a malarial parasite from a cobra de capello."

<sup>1</sup> John, 4: 48.



The severest arraignment of the philosophy of Christian Science is that in denying the existence of matter, it throws over common sense. That the whole race of man should be mistaken in assuming the existence of matter, or that its existence could be disproved by a mind which, under known conditions at least, cannot think without it, is a paradox which lacks the element of appeal, as well as the element of truth.

It is to be expected that such superstitions will flourish most where character and training are ill-balanced, where people have the "little knowledge" that is "a dangerous thing," where the normal nervous life is severely disturbed by the breaking up of the healthful family life on account of the hardships of our civilization, and where men's psychical systems are wasted in excesses of amusement and dissipation or perverted through fine spun speculations. It must be the task of the religious teacher to insist upon the validity of the deliverance of the normal consciousness as revealing the will of God and the way of life. But this thought brings us to a new division of the field of Religious Psychology, upon which the limits of this article forbid our entering.

## THE OUTWARD FORM OF THE ORIGINAL SIN. A NEW STUDY OF GENESIS 3.

BY REV. ARTHUR E. WHATHAM.

In a letter recently received by the author of this article from a brother clergyman, a well-known archæologist, the writer asserted that modern scholars are pretty well agreed as to the meaning of the third chapter of Genesis, which, in their view, describes in veiled language the supposed first human physical union, and its consequence.

Feeling that my friend had expressed merely the opinion of certain specialists in archæology and ethnology, and that the view of such on the point in question was not that of the ordinary scholar, and especially not that of the Bible scholar and teacher, I replied to this letter giving reasons for my dissenting from this opinion.

My reply brought a second letter in which the writer acknowledged that I was right. I expected this, since I know from considerable correspondence on this subject that the opinion in question is confined to a few specialists; while it is even rejected by the ordinary Bible scholar. The learned Bishop Newton in his dissertations on "Prophecy," referring to the character or form of the offence recorded in Gen. 3, wrote, "What was the particular nature of the sin of our first parents, it is not an easy matter to determine. It was plainly the violation of a divine prohibition; it was indulging in an unlawful appetite; it was aspiring after forbidden knowledge, and pretending to be wise above their condition. So much may be safely asserted in general; we bewilder and lose ourselves in search of more particulars."

Prebendary Quarry, in his "Genesis and its Authorship," writes, "there is nothing in the account to throw any light on the particular offence which was of such terrible consequence to mankind at large."

Prof. Toy, in the Jour. Bib. Lit. (1898), rejects the opinion that the fruit is connected with sexual ideas—it is *real* fruit of a *real* tree, not symbolical; while Auberlen on the First Sin (Bib. Sac. 22) is silent as to the nature of the sin.

The three most noted dictionaries of the Bible—Smith's, Hastings's, and Ency. Bib., together with McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, in their articles which treat of the "Fall," refrain from discussing this special point, while their general remarks appear to endorse Prof. Toy's view.

Bishop Ryle, in his "Early Narratives of Genesis," and Prof. Driver, in his recent Commentary on Genesis, both treat the offence in question as exhibited in some simple and apparently harmless act such as the plucking of actual fruit. In fact, I know of no biblical work which treats the record in Gen. 3, as dealing with a sexual act.

When we come to works dealing with archæology, religion, and ethnology, then we have numerous references to the transgression in Gen. 3, from the standpoint of its sexual character.

Jastrow, in his Bab. Assy. Religion; Barton, in his Semitic Origins; Peters, in his "Early Hebrew Story;" Crawley, in his treatise on marriage in his Mystic Rose; Trumbull, in his Threshold Covenant; besides the numerous volumes on Sex-Worship which I refrain from mentioning because these latter are not received as of weight by scholars. There are, however, as I have shown, enough works by specialists of world wide reputation in which the view in question is held, to make it worth while to examine the matter critically from their standpoint. I shall make this attempt in the following article, an attempt which, so far as I know, is the first of its kind; the first, I mean, to examine the entire third chapter of Genesis from the accepted scientific standpoint that it records an act of sexual transgression.

I shall begin by asking certain questions which naturally present themselves upon a thoughtful résumé after a critical examination of the details in Gen. 3.

(1) Why is a serpent and not some other animal introduced into the narrative?

(2) Why is the serpent associated with the woman exclusively?

(3) Why is the serpent made to assume a creeping posture by way of punishment?

(4) Why are two trees mentioned with the inference that the fruit of neither was to be eaten except under conditions which are not mentioned.

(5) Why is eating specially made an act of offence?



(6) Why are the eyes of both represented as opened only after they had eaten in company?

(7) Why is nakedness implied as exposure only of the organs of sex?

(8) Why were fig-leaves chosen for loin-girdles in preference to other leaves?

(9) Why did they attribute their hiding themselves to the fear of being seen naked when they had already covered their nakedness?

(10) Why is the woman's physical desire represented as stronger for the man than that of the man for the woman?

(11) Why, both in this and the first chapter, is there reference made to Eve becoming a mother, when it is not until the fourth chapter that the man is said to know his wife?

(12) Why is it that in the third chapter, offspring are to be ushered in with sorrow under a curse; while in the first, they are to be begotten as the outcome of a blessing?

(13) Why did not the idea of eating of the tree of life occur to the transgressors as soon as they had eaten of the tree of knowledge?

(14) Why are cherubim mentioned as being placed to "guard the tree of life?"

Before attempting to answer these questions, it is necessary to impress upon the mind of the reader, (1) the object of the narrative in Gen. 3, (2) the character and age of the material chosen to depict it, and (3) the period when the narrative finally assumed its present form.

(1) The object of the narrative is to account for the presence of evil in the world. There is, however, another account of this origin in Gen. 6: 1-8, upon which the Book of Enoch lays more emphasis than upon the account in Gen. 3, as though the former had been more widely adopted as the better explanation. The Book of Enoch gives both accounts.

(2) In Gen. 3, we have a mixture of what I believe the authors themselves accepted as both fact and fable, by which they attempted to produce, in good faith, an account of the beginning of humanity which neither an actual historical sketch, so far as they were able to give it, nor an entirely mythical narrative would satisfy.

It is a point disputed by modern scholars how far the details have been borrowed from a Babylonian source. Some of these undoubtedly

were, others, however, I believe to have been drawn from local independent myth and folk-lore, or myth and folk-lore common to most primitive people. These variant elements fully account for the disjointed character of the narrative. There are inconsistencies and breaks in the narrative which have puzzled the general commentator, but which are perfectly natural in a record containing the elements described. With these elements combined, we have in Gen. 3, under a mask of symbolism, an account of something believed to have actually happened.

(3) The narrative as we now have it, I believe to have been produced after the Exile. Most of its elements existed from primitive times, but some have been added for the first time in later periods. Then, too, its literary style evidences that it belongs to a later stage of Hebrew literature.

With the above three points well in view, I shall now endeavor to answer the foregoing fourteen questions.

(1) No other animal but the serpent could have played the rôle in this narrative which it is the object of the record to depict. Scholars have seen in the serpent as here introduced, (a) a snake deity (Toy, JBL. Vol. 3); (b) a symbol of sexual passion (Jastrow, AJSL., Vol. 15, p. 209); (c) a mere beast of the field (Dillmann, Genesis, Vol. 1, p. 148; Driver, Gen., p. 44, 47; Bennet, Gen., p. 104).

The failure so far satisfactorily to explain the character and position of the serpent, has arisen from its separate treatment from each of these conceptions. The truth of the matter is that the rôle this creature is made to play in Gen. 3, called for a combination of all of these three conceptions.

(a) As a snake-deity the serpent represents the well known Semitic belief in serpent-jinns, supernatural beings, which, while they could appear and disappear, had nevertheless material bodies. Certain kinds of them were supposed to frequent trees, a belief which very possibly lent its weight to the association of our serpent with the tree of knowledge (W. R. Smith, LRS., p. 120). Whitehouse is evidently correct in seeing in the serpent—"who tempts Eve and lures man to his doom, a demon in animal shape, analogous to the Arabic jinn which frequently resides in serpents" (HBD, Satan). He does not mean that these jinns took possession of serpents, but that jinns themselves assumed the shape of serpents, and that it was one of these which appears in this narrative. Under "Demon" he writes,—“in the narrative of the

temptation of Eve by the serpent, there is no hint that an evil spirit resided in the serpent. The serpent is identified with it, and we have no suggestion that a demon was able to detach itself from the animal and pass into something else. This was a later development."

It was not, however, only *some* serpents that were viewed by the ancients as serpent demons, or jinns. Speaking of the serpent as representing a special class of reptiles, Dillmann says,—“it was feared as a wonderful, mysterious, demoniacal being, and, therefore, far and wide, amongst ancient and modern peoples of a lower type, honored as divine.” (Gen., Vol. 1, p. 147).

Driver informs us that Arabs believe there lurks a jinn in every serpent (Gen., p. 44); while Robertson Smith says, that when the Arabs were no longer pure savages, and had ceased to ascribe demoniac attributes to most animals, they yet continued to attribute them to jinns. (LRS., p. 128).

To the serpent of Genesis, however, Eve is represented as talking without any fear. This is because the narrative points back to a time when it was considered quite natural that men and animals should hold converse with each other. Time was when both gods and men were viewed as possessing part human and part animal forms (Mythology-Ency. Brit.; Sayce, Hib. Lec. p. 279; Jastrow, Bab.-Assy. Rel., pp. 474, 475). We must remember, also, that the narrative is describing matters as they were supposed to be before sin had entered into the world, consequently, animals, even demon-serpents, or serpent jinns, would be viewed as able to hold converse with men without arousing any dread or surprise in the latter.

Now the serpent of this narrative not only puts itself upon an equality with Yahweh as regards its knowledge, but it presumes to know better, since it denies the statement of Yahweh, attributing the prohibition not to eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge to envy, lest a quality possessed by the gods should become possessed by humanity also (Driver *ib.* 45; Bennett, Gen., p. 105). A creature pitting itself in knowledge against a being whom it evidently conceded to be greater than itself, truly deserves to be spoken of as Prof. Toy calls it,—“a snake-deity.” Yahweh had said, “Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.” This the woman told the serpent, only to be met with the astounding reply,—“Ye shall not surely die: for Yahweh doth know that in the



day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods" (ver. 3, 4, 5; cf. 22 and RV).

(b) Prof. Barton doubts that the Rabbis were correct in seeing in the serpent here a representation or symbol of sexual passion (Sem. Orig., p. 93). They undoubtedly were in error in viewing the serpent as a mere personification of sexual passion, but there was something after all in the thought, which I shall endeavor to bring out later.

Dr. Peters tells us that,—“Mingled with the story of temptation and knowledge, is the story of the hostility of the serpent.” He adds that,—“The story is an answer to the question. Why is there such hostility between man and serpent?” (Early Hebrew Story, pp. 224-229.) Now all this is true, yet he neglects to point out where the hostility in question is shown in the story. His mere reference to the fact that it was by the serpent’s advice that the woman first and then the man took of the fruit of the forbidden tree (*ib.*, p. 232), throws no light on the point; neither does his reference to the identification of the Hebrew serpent with the Babylonian Tiamat (*ib.*, p. 229). The serpent in Gen 3, has but a very remote relation either to the Babylonian serpent of chaos, or the Hebrew serpent of the deep. It is not, as originally introduced, an enemy of Yahweh in the sense of the Babylonian and Hebrew narratives of the overthrow of the respective powers of evil. Indeed, it is questionable whether it can be viewed as an enemy of Yahweh in any other sense than as a member of a demon class of creatures, incapable of opposing the power of the supreme deity, except by crafty and lustful insinuations dropped into the mind of man. Thus Dillmann, Marcus Dods, Driver and Bennett in their respective commentaries on Genesis; Tulloch in the Ency. Brit.) Devil; Whitehouse, in HBD—Demon; and Cheyne in the Ency. Bib.—Serpent,—refuse to see in the serpent of Gen. 3, the Evil One of later Hebrew conception.

I cannot, however, agree with Cheyne in his description of this creature as “the friendly serpent of Gen. 3,” “nor yet in his statement that the serpent’s offence consisted—not in ill will to God’s noblest creature, man, but in exciting intellectual pride.” This it undoubtedly did excite, but simply in order to further its own crafty and lustful ends, which it well knew would work mischief to man. It is true that the serpent’s act was prompted not by ill will either to Yahweh or man, but in pursuance of its own selfish lust it became indifferently the enemy of both.

But if the serpent of Gen. 3, has no connection with the powers of evil, either of earlier or later ages, how does it come to figure at all in this narrative?

I have already intimated that while the object of this narrative is to describe the entrance of evil into the world, there is another and different account in Gen. 6: 1-4. This difference, however, is not in the way in which the evil was introduced, but in the persons by whom it was introduced.

I have already described Gen. 3, as a record of an act of sexual intercourse. Prof. Barton asserts that here,—“a beast is represented as urging man to union with woman.” (So., p. 94). Dr. Peters endorses this in his statement that,—“the reader of to-day scarcely takes in its true meaning. The physical union indicated escapes his notice” (EHS., p. 222).

Turning now to Gen. 6: 1-4, we find that divine beings called angels, lusted after the beautiful daughters of men, and married them. It is to this lust on the part of supernatural beings that the “Book of Enoch” attributes the entrance of evil into the world. It repeats this story, and attributes in the main the introduction of sin, not to Adam, but to these fallen angels.

The Book of Enoch describes Eve as led astray by Gadreel, the third of the four chief angels who rebelled against Yahweh (LXIX-I). In Sota 9a, and Beresh. Rabba 18, the temptation is ascribed to lustful jealousy; while Bereshith 42, ascribes the birth of Cain to the union of Satan (the leader of the fallen angels, identified with the serpent) and Eve (HBD., Satan).

I said a little while back that there was something in the view of the Rabbis which pictured the serpent as the symbol of sexual passion. We now see that they not only viewed it as this symbol, but that they also identified it with a fallen angel whom they conceived to have been the father of Cain. This later and fanciful Rabbinical thought had this much truth in it, viz., that it rightly interpreted the serpent’s presence in Gen. 3, to be based upon its erotic designs on women. How fully they were warranted by primitive belief in holding this view will be abundantly evidenced in an appeal to ethnology.

“How does it happen,”—writes Havelock Ellis, “that in all parts of the world, the snake . . . has been credited with some design, sinister or erotic, on women?” Again he says,—“There can be no doubt

that in widely different parts of the world menstruation is believed to have been originally caused by a snake, and that this conception is frequently associated with an erotic and mystic idea'' (Psy. of Sex, pp. 237, 238). In his "Man and Woman," he again makes this statement (p. 14), further adding that, "in the Hebrew story of the Garden of Eden we trace a similar primitive connection between woman and the snake" (15).

Crawley, in his "Mystic Rose," says—"The connection of the serpent with sexual matters is very familiar, especially in European folklore, and is found all over the world." Referring to the narrative in Gen. 3, he adds, "There is an unmistakable reference to sexual relation in the story," a remark endorsed by Letourneau in his, "Evolution of Marriage" (pp. 193, 382; 6).

At the first menstruation of a Chiriguano girl, old women run about the hut with sticks striking at the snake which has wounded her (Crawley, p. 192). Female idols belonging to people of similar thought exhibit a snake in an erotic position; while in various parts of the world virgin priestesses are dedicated and married to a snake-god (Havelock Ellis, Psychology of Sex, Vol. 11, pp. 237, 238). Even the Greeks credited Zeus as having in the form of a serpent become the father of human offspring (Mythology, Ency. Brit.).

With all this evidence before us, it becomes easy to answer the question,—“Why is a serpent and not some other animal introduced into the narrative in Gen. 3?” This narrative is the record of a sexual act entailing serious consequences. It was an act committed, as we shall see later, in opposition to expressed prohibition. We have already seen this, but it will appear more prominently under another heading. It appertains here to say that the authors of this narrative were not willing to ascribe the origin of the transgression of this prohibition to the newly created innocent pair, so they explained it by introducing a fully accredited belief, which must have been as well known in their folklore as in that of other peoples. Thus it is that we have the serpent introduced into this narrative, and not some other animal, since it is this creature with its erotic proclivities which is made to bear the blame as the instigator of the transgression.

(c) In affirming that the serpent of Gen. 3, is “merely a beast of the field which Yahweh had made,” Dillmann, Bennett and others, overlook the fact of the differing elements of which the narrative is com-



posed, consequently, they not only fail to interpret correctly the various statements in the narrative touching the serpent, but they explain these in a somewhat singular manner.

Dillmann (p. 148), is correct in refusing to see with Bennett (p. 103), any connection between the serpent in Gen. 3, and the Babylonian Tiamat, but he is in error (p. 149), in refusing to see with Driver (p. 44), more than an ordinary animal. The serpent in Gen. 3, was not only wise with the wisdom of an animal, but it was subtle with the knowledge of a semi-divine being. In fact, it was a member of a demon-class of creatures known as jinns. It was a serpent-jinn. Thus it is that we find it presuming to pit its knowledge against that of the supreme deity, whom, as we have seen, it even went so far as to contradict. Prof. Bennett infers that the serpent in Gen. 3, corresponds to the Babylonian Tiamat in playing the part of the enemy of God and man (Gen., pp. 102, 103). So also does Ryle (*Early Narratives of Gen.*, p. 38). Prof. Cheyne, however, is correct in refusing to see any such correspondence (*Serpent, Ency. Bib.*), since there is not the shadow of resemblance between Yahweh and the serpent of Gen. 3, on the one hand, with Marduk and Tiamat on the other. Yahweh has no need to wage war with the serpent as Marduk had with Tiamat. The serpent of Gen. 3, represents no powers of darkness such as Tiamat represented. It is a creature entirely subservient to the commands of Yahweh. His enemy only in the sense already pointed out, an enemy of man only in the same sense.

While all this is true, the assertion of both Dillmann (p. 156) and Driver (47) that the serpent being an animal is not morally responsible for its action, shows a neglect to view this creature from the different standpoints in which it is introduced into the narrative. Here it is an animal, while it is also something more than an animal. It is a supernatural animal possessing divine attributes, and so, in using these to the hurt of man in an effort to accomplish its own selfish ends, it becomes morally responsible for its action. Dillmann, in denying its responsibility, justifies its punishment on the ground that an animal inflicting injury to man is to be punished with death, and refers to Gen. 9:5; Ex. 21: 25 f. Driver, on the other hand, while previously acknowledging that the serpent is a supernatural animal (p. 44), yet now, in explaining its punishment, makes no use of this acknowledgment, saying—"The serpent being an animal, is not morally responsible, it is

punished here as the representative of evil thought and suggestion. Bennett thinks it unnecessary to discuss the question, though he suggests that a beast which could talk, and tempt man, and tell lies about God, might very well be morally responsible. He adds from the remark,—“upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat,”—“these details show that the author is thinking of an animal” (p. 108). This is true, but they show something more, which all of these commentators have failed to note, and which I shall explain in my answer to question (3).

(2) We can see now, from what has been stated under section (b) of answer (1), why the serpent of Gen. 3 is associated only with the woman, the man remaining entirely outside of the circle in which the serpent and the woman move. The serpent is introduced into the narrative merely because of its well known erotic association with woman, an association in which man has no concern; consequently,—there being no object in mentioning the man in connection with the serpent—the narrative deals only with the serpent in connection with the woman.

But instead of this very natural, and indeed only possible explanation, certain commentators, missing the real reason of the serpent's introduction into this narrative, have attempted to explain it, to say the least, in a very singular manner.

Cheyne (Ency. Bib.—Adam) informs us that Adam represents reason, and Eve sense. As it is sense that enslaves reason, the serpent does not venture to attack Adam except through Eve.

Both Dillmann (p. 150) and Driver (p. 44) infer that the serpent talked to the woman because she was the *weaker* vessel and more easily seduced.

(3) In the curse put upon the serpent as described in the narrative, “Upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat,” we have an indication that the serpent was considered morally responsible for the mischief it had worked. The words truly indicate that the serpent was an animal, but they indicate more; that it was, to use the words of Cheyne—“a divine, or semi-divine serpent” (Serpent—Ency. Bib.). It is in failing to view the serpent in this double aspect, that Dillmann falls into error in denying that the description of the serpent implies that before the curse it had been capable of assuming an erect posture (p. 157). He is right, however, in assuming that the description does *not* imply that before the curse the serpent had possessed some other

form than that of an ordinary snake. This is the view of Ryle (Early Narratives of Gen., p. 53); while Bennett (Gen., p. 108) and Marcus Dods (Gen., p. 17) think that the words of the curse imply that previously it did not crawl on its belly as an ordinary snake crawls. The words of the curse, however, do not go so far as this. All they imply is that previously the serpent had been able to assume an upright posture in moving about, but that from henceforth it should move about only on its belly. Cheyne is therefore only partly correct in asserting that the narrative implies that originally the serpent had been erect," and that, "this was a survival from the time when it was thought to be divine" (Serpent—Enc. Bib.). The narrative itself views the serpent as semi-divine at the very time the curse was put upon it.

The recognition of the existence of jinns or demons in later Hebrew thought, was a survival of primitive Semitic belief still accepted at the time this narrative was put in its present form (Demon-Ency. Bib.). They were not viewed as gods, but as supernatural beings (WRS-LRS, p. 119) and subject to higher power, such as in the present instance that exercised by Yahweh.

Thus the record in Gen. 3 is in keeping with contemporary thought when it not only introduces a serpent-demon or jinn into its narrative, but when, from the mischief resulting from its action, it further depicts a limitation of its powers by a higher power. This limitation was the restriction of some power hitherto enjoyed. Up to this time it had not only crawled upon its belly as an ordinary serpent crawls, and even as serpent-jinns were credited with crawling (WRS-LRS, p. 129), but just as these creatures were viewed as able, without changing their serpent form, to move about otherwise than on their bellies (*ib.*, p. 133), so the serpent of this narrative is inferred as having been able before the curse to move about otherwise than by crawling, while still retaining its natural serpent shape.

The belief expressed in this narrative that the serpent, while still retaining the ordinary form of a serpent was able to move about otherwise than by crawling, which here I believe to have been conceived as an erect movement, is illustrated in a statement of Nebuchadnezzar that,—“On the threshold of the gates I set up mighty bulls of bronze, and huge serpents that stood *erect*” (Sayce, EHH, p. 225, note; see also Serpent-Ency. Bib.). This Nebuchadnezzar reigned B. C. 604-561, and as we see the belief still existing at that period that the serpent as



a supernatural creature could stand and move in an erect posture, although possessing the ordinary snake form, we are warranted in saying that this illustration shows that the narrative in Gen. 3, as we have it to-day, is of very late origin, since at the period in which it was put in its present form, snakes were still viewed as supernatural beings, although no longer credited with possessing the power to move in an erect posture.

The curse in limiting the motion of the serpent to crawling, dealt a severe blow to the power and pride of the entire serpent-demon class, placing it on a level of the noxious creeping things. It had in its pride presumed to pit its knowledge against Yahweh, consequently, it must be humbled. It possessed the power to move in an erect posture, a posture peculiar to the gods, and to man made in their physical image (Peters-EHS, pp. 219, 227). This it must no longer be permitted to share, therefore the power to do so is withdrawn, by a greater and more fully divine power. This is done. This is the curse on the serpent. Henceforth it shall only move on its belly, a degraded and despised creeping thing.

Still, while the posture of its locomotion is limited, its lustful, hurtful nature, so dangerous to women, cannot be changed. It is its very being. To change it would be to make a new creature of it, which was impossible. It can be guarded against, however, consequently Yahweh from that time will put enmity between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent forever.

Here then we have the answer to the question,—“Why is the serpent made to assume a creeping posture by way of punishment?” To destroy its pride, to remove it from the level of gods and men, and to make it a crawling obnoxious creature. The answer is simple enough when the various elements of which the narrative is composed are taken into account, and an explanation attempted from this combined standpoint. Had the general commentator only done this; had the serpent as an ordinary beast of the field; as a creature of folk-lore; and again of primitive belief, been explained from the standpoint of these combined elements, the real character of the serpent of this narrative would have been seen long ago. Instead of this, however, the general commentator has endeavored to explain the serpent from one or more of these standpoints separately, resulting in some curious and unnatural exegesis. Especially is this so regarding Gen. 3:15.

The second of the two clauses into which this verse is divided has been translated and explained in different ways. In the AV it runs,—“it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.” In the Vulgate it runs,—“She shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt lay snares for her.” Undoubtedly the Vulgate, while not true to the literal rendering of the original Hebrew, although the same may be said of all the renderings I intend to examine, gives the best sense of any of them.

The English RV runs,—“it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.” The American RV runs,—“he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.”

A more correct, literal, and explanatory rendering would be,—“it, *i. e.*, the woman’s seed shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise their, *i. e.*, her seed’s heel.”

In this prophecy neither the man, nor his offspring, as specially male descendants, enter into any relationship with the serpent. Dillman explains the meaning of this passage as,—“Instead of the friendly relationship between the woman and the serpent, which for the woman has been so unfortunate, an irreconcilable conflict is to be kindled between man and the accursed beast (p. 160).”

I cannot but think that a better explanation according to the more literal rendering and meaning, and one with which the Vulgate agrees, is that,—as the woman in the first instance has been outraged by the serpent, so her seed shall revenge her by a continued and successful war on its offspring, who in turn, in accordance with their still lustful nature, will carry on an unceasing attempt to *seduce* her offspring. This interpretation is in keeping with the entire drift of the narrative, while it is more in harmony with the passage we have been considering.

It was against the woman that the serpent’s attack had been directly aimed, since the man became included in the mischief only subsequently through Eve, who having first been successfully seduced by the serpent, in turn successfully seduced Adam. Thus, in *her* wrong being avenged, so far as the serpent is concerned, *she* strikes a deadly blow at its seed through *her* seed.

And here it becomes important to ask, does the narrative imply that the serpent itself had intercourse with the woman? Undoubtedly it does, if the interpretation of the entire narrative which I am giving is correct, and it is singular that not only the teaching of mythology and folklore, but even later Jewish thought as well, sustains this conclusion.

But what about the protevangelium which has been seen in this passage by so many commentators? Bennett is correct in stating with reference to the "Incarnation" that,—“There is nothing to indicate that any such ideas were in the mind of the writer” (p. 109). This is true, and with it agree both Dillmann (p. 161) and Driver (p. 48), yet there is here after all a protevangelium which Driver acknowledges with Dillmann, but which the late Samuel Davidson better expressed than either, although Cheyne comes very near it. “Man’s salvation,” wrote the former, “is practicable through the victory of reason over instinct, of faith over sense” (Adam, *Ency. Brit.*); while the latter writes, “Man on his part is to keep up the war against temptation to pride as vigorously as he prosecutes his war against the serpent, now become his deadly foe” (Serpent, *Ency. Bib.*).

The protevangelium of this passage is the triumph of reason over sense. The narrative in Gen. 3, is a record of pride and lust, which have ever been joint companions. The record sees in this combination the origin of all the evil of the world in which mankind is sunk. In Gen. 6:1-4, the origin of this is attributed to the pride and lust of the sons of the gods, lesser personal divine beings of the same nature as the higher deity or deities. Gen. 3 has the same distressing story to tell, but here it is based not upon the pride and lust of supernatural beings, such as the sons of the gods, but upon that of lower creatures, supernatural demon-animals, linked with the animals by bodily structure, separated from them by the possession of a supernatural knowledge and power which links them with the gods. Such, in the conception of this narrative, were serpent-jinns.

(4) I have already admitted that some of the details of this narrative belong to a Babylonian source. It will not surprise us therefore to find that a tree of life belongs to Babylonian mythology; also that the name Eden itself is the title of an exceedingly fertile part of Babylonia (Peters-EBS, p. 209). Dillmann also is but partly correct in claiming that the tree of knowledge of good and evil is peculiar to the biblical narrative (Genesis, Vol. 11, p. 122), since Babylonia further knew of a tree of wisdom which grew in a holy garden, upon the core or heart of which was inscribed the name of the god of wisdom (Sayce-Hib. *Lec.*, pp. 238-242).

Prof. Barton is of opinion that while we have two trees in this narrative as it now stands, originally there was but one, the tree of knowl-



edge; the tree of life being a later addition (SO., p. 95). Prof. Toy is of the same opinion (JBL., Vol. 10). I rather incline to the view of Cheyne that it is the tree of knowledge which was subsequently added to the original story. Originally the one tree represented both life and wisdom. If, however, as the authors of this narrative as we now have it undoubtedly intended, the two gifts were to be viewed as separate and distinct, then there must be a separate and distinct source of each, consequently, the tree of double quality must be divided and two trees introduced into the garden. Had this not been done, the transgressors in eating of the tree of knowledge would also have secured life, which the original tree equally possessed. Now the narrative in Gen. 3, was conceived long after the tree of life with its double miraculous quality, and as it is with its gift of wisdom that the narrative deals, it was this gift which was dissociated from the original tree and introduced into Gen. 3, as a separate and distinct tree. This was further necessary because in participating in the knowledge which the tree was able to bestow, the transgressors would have obtained life by the same act of eating at the one time. To save this, the narrators had to divide these combined gifts, leaving the original tree with its power of bestowing life, while they introduced another tree with the power of bestowing knowledge.

(5) As the serpent was introduced into the narrative of a sexual act and its consequences because of its erotic association with women, so eating was here made the act of disobedience because eating when indulged in by unmarried persons of opposite sex, has from the earliest times been viewed as the symbol of the consummation of marriage. Eve offered Adam food, and they ate together, a universal primitive proposal of marriage and the commonest of all marriage ceremonies by which bride and bridegroom become one flesh (Crawley, pp. 345, 376, 378).

(6) Dillmann asserts that Adam was in company with Eve when she ate for the first time (Vol. 1, p. 153). The drift of the narrative, however, is absolutely opposed to any such view. She ate first in company with the serpent. There was no opening of eyes here because there was no mutual transgression. It was by their eating together that the knowledge first came to them of their mutual nakedness. The words are,—‘‘She took the fruit thereof and did eat.’’ Were her eyes opened? If not—why not? Had they been opened she would have dropped the half eaten fruit in terror as soon as she had swallowed the

first mouthful, for it is ludicrous to suppose that she swallowed the whole fruit at one mouthful. But she had eaten and enjoyed the fruit, and her eyes were not opened to any serious consequences.

Having in her own person demonstrated that the fruit was good for food, or in other words, her seduction by the serpent having failed to open her eyes, she in turn seduces Adam by eating with him as she had already eaten with the serpent. Mark how the words run. "She . . . gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat. And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked." Strange that there were no eyes opened until the man had also eaten, if the mere eating of the fruit of this tree was to impart knowledge to every one who ate. The significance of the narrative is plain, viz., that it was from some act committed by joint participation that their eyes were to be opened for the first time simultaneously.

Again, it is absurd to suppose that Adam had stood by Eve all the while the serpent had been conversing with her, without saying anything; and that he had seen her put forth her hand to take of the fruit without one word of warning. Had he done so, the blame would have been his in the first instance even more than the woman's, and he never would have said,—the woman she gave me, etc. Their proximity at the first eating is only apparent from the condensation of the narrative. Of course he was with her when she gave him and he ate, for the narrative intends the eating, so far as the man and woman are concerned, to be eating in company with each other.

(7) That the exposure of the organs of sex was the nakedness at which Adam and his wife felt ashamed, is abundantly proved by their having made clothing merely to cover those parts. That they now saw themselves naked where such exposure had not been previously realized, could only follow upon personal knowledge of the natural use of what hitherto they had not understood. This explains the conception of nakedness in Gen. 3.

(8) Missing the drift of the story, and the significance of a fig-leaf in the mind of an Oriental, commentators have been led to offer some strange explanations why fig-leaves were introduced into this narrative. The fig-leaf in the East is a well understood symbol of sex, consequently, it is quite easy to understand why an Eastern narrative should choose fig-leaves when describing the making of the supposed first clothing, or loin-girdles.

(9) The guilty pair hid themselves not because they were afraid of being seen naked. They were afraid of Yahweh seeing that they themselves had discovered their own nakedness, which would have been demonstrated by the clothing they now wore over that nakedness. They were in fact more afraid now in being seen clothed than they had been before in being seen naked. The narrative shows clearly that it was not their nakedness of which they were afraid, but of the use to which they had put that nakedness.

(10) Woman's desire is expressed as stronger for the man than the man's for the woman in accordance with the drift of the narrative. Orientals credit women with greater passion than they credit men with possessing. This indeed is the conception upon which the narrative itself is based. Finally, men shall rule over women because the stronger passion of the latter will make them the slaves of the sex less moved by such desires.

There is much more truth here than most of us will like to admit upon first thought. The ordinary conception of woman to-day removes her beyond any possibility of viewing her from such a standpoint, and yet, while with us the name woman stands, and justly so, for all we mean by the terms purity and grace, Gen. 3, in its conception of woman, nevertheless, expresses not merely a profound, but also an alarming truth. All ethnologists know how lightly virtue weighs with primitive woman. The student of morals is aware that religious orgies have ever owed their continuance, and in many cases their origin, more to the influence of women than to men. The sociologist finds almost an entire absence of morals amongst women of wealth who at the same time are unencumbered with the restraints of religion. These are the facts underlying the statement of the woman's desire in Gen. 3. They are not palatable, we do not like them, yet they are profoundly true, and tend to enhance the value of the narrative we are discussing. At the same time the narrative promised women the victory over erotic enslavement. This is a truth which has not yet been grasped owing to the erroneous interpretation of Gen. 3. The symbol of eroticism, the serpent, was to have its head crushed by the seed of the woman. This, as I have already said, is the protevangelium contained in Gen. 3:15. Look at the modern woman, the modern mother, the modern housewife, the modern companion of man. With every inducement physically and socially to occupy a lower level morally than man, and here



is seen the idea of the continued biting of the heel of the woman's descendants by the serpent's descendants, she has risen *higher* than the man, until to-day we are in some danger of deifying the very name of woman.

(11) Reference is made in the first three chapters of Genesis to Eve becoming a mother, although marital relations are first definitely referred to only in the fourth chapter, because the authors have this result in mind as the pivot upon which their entire record hangs. The idea of sex is the main thread which runs through the entire narrative.

(12) The fact that in Gen. 3, offspring are viewed as being ushered in with a curse, with pains of child-bearing, while in Gen. 1, they are referred to as a blessing, is in complete harmony with the entire drift of the narrative as we have explained it, but incomprehensible otherwise. Explained our way, it further emphasizes some well-known beliefs amongst primitive people.

With primitive people marriage itself is considered sinful and theoretically forbidden. Physical relationship when lawfully exercised under the marriage contract is viewed as a sin. Sickness and the pains of childbirth are conceived as resulting from forbidden intercourse (Crawley, MR., pp. 320, 214, 74).

Trumbull, in his "Threshold Covenant," asserts that the first act of human disobedience was incontinence, in transgression of a specific command to abstain, at least for a time, from carnal intercourse" (p. 237). Crawley adds to the above that primitive people believe that temporary self-denial will obviate risks incurred in the exercise of a dangerous satisfaction; while he further refers to the habit of prayer before intercourse (*ib.*, 133).

Surely all these primitive ideas had their effect upon the making of the narrative we are discussing. They explain as nothing else will explain many deep and important points. They show why sorrow and pain followed the begetting of offspring by the guilty pair, when their increase should have been to them a blessing and a joy, as promised in the beginning.

(13) But why did not this discovery of coming evil prompt the guilty pair to eat at once of the tree of life as the correction of the death to all their bright hopes? Because there was no actual tree of life to eat from, any more than there had been an actual tree of knowledge. Commentators are fond of talking about symbolical language,

and mythical figures, and then they set to work to interpret this narrative as a page of actual history. That it contains what the narrators supposed in some cases to have been historical features, I have abundantly conceded. But the record is a mixture of varying elements, and can only be explained when all of these are made due allowance for.

(Of all commentators, Quarry most clearly states that both these trees are not *real* trees, but rather symbols of conditions, or states of conditions to be entered upon through the continuance of certain relationships between man and his Creator (Genesis, pp. 112, 113). Surely he is correct, and if so, the two trees as *actual* trees may be dismissed from our minds, and with this dismissal the difficulties vanish which have presented themselves from viewing the trees as real trees.

But if the two trees are mere imaginary figures, may this not also be said of the serpent? No, because the authors are anxious to lay the blame incurred in the transgression upon an outside agent, with whom originated the intelligent and so responsible breaking of the prohibition. In Gen. 6, this is found in the person of the fallen angels, or sons of the gods. In Gen. 3, it is found in the well known erotic serpent, equally believed in with the sons of the gods themselves.

(14) Many explanations have been attempted touching the cherubim placed in the way of the tree of life to prevent the possibility of the guilty pair reaching and partaking of it. These creatures, however, were merely idealized guardians of an idealized tree, and had no more actual existence than the tree itself. The idea did not, however, originate with the authors of Gen. 3, since similar guardians are well known in Babylonian and Assyrian belief.

In bringing this examination to a close, should it be questioned why sexual intercourse was chosen by the authors of Gen. 3, to signify the act of prohibition they record, it may reasonably be asked in return, why a sexual act was chosen in Gen. 6:14 to depict the introduction of sin? Both origins are, as I previously said, of the same character, a fact which materially strengthens the accuracy of the interpretation of Gen. 3, attempted in these pages. That the narrative here recorded is based upon a sexual act is the opinion of the noted scholars to whom I have referred. Are they right? If so, the details of the narrative itself will prove it. I have endeavored to show that every detail given amply warrants their conclusion. Such an examination as I have attempted has never been undertaken before. That it was necessary,

and should be considered of great value, is shown in the extraordinary fact that not one biblical scholar or teacher in any of our schools of biblical study has ever attempted to explain this wonderful chapter of Genesis as understood by the ordinary scientist. On the contrary, the explanation usually offered in theological seminaries touching this narrative, is in direct opposition to the view of it held by the ordinary scientist. In the hope therefore of rightly adjusting this matter, I have undertaken the foregoing excursion.



# THE SERMON: A STUDY IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY.

By L. W. KLINE,

*State Normal School, Duluth, Minn., Sometime Fellow in Clark University.*

Studies of ethical and religious movements are by common consent considered legitimate problems for theologians, sociologists and popular essayists. Only within the last decade has the psychologist entered these fields with a view to describe and explain those mental processes aroused through the interrelation of many minds. The Psychology of "Varieties of Religious Experience," of "The Crowd," of "Public Worship," of "Religious Conversions," of "Suggestion" are among the subjects treated from his view point. "The Psychology of the Sermon" classifies with these subjects in so far as it deals with phenomena of the social mind.

Objective experimentation has absorbed the major part of mind investigation for the last two decades. This form of inquiry into mental life deals with three interrelated facts:—stimulus, consciousness, reaction. The intensity and quality of the first and third and the nature and content of the second are matters of concern to the approach and study of all experimental mind problems. In the study of those mental processes common to the social mind, it seems not only convenient to keep the three factors conspicuously in view, but, as a matter of orderly procedure, to allow them to form the leading topics of the investigation. Accordingly the nature of the consciousness addressed by the sermon will form the first topic of this paper.

The generally accepted notion of consciousness among empiricists regards it as the sum total of the mental processes from moment to moment or even in any one moment. Now, just as processes in other sciences contain differentiating qualities, for example, the processes of efflorescence and deliquescence in chemistry, so the processes forming states of consciousness from moment to moment have their determining characteristics. These give in the aggregate individuality to the states of consciousness, so it comes about that groups of congruent states may be described, explained and classified like any other natural phenomena.

It is generally agreed that the social-mind as opposed to the individual-mind is dominated by instinct-feelings, emotions and sentiments, that the critical judgment and conscious personality may disappear or be reduced to an impotent condition, and that the thoughts and feelings of the members of the community are unified and turned in a definite direction absorbed in a common purpose. The purely aggressive and critical processes may become inoperative, while the receptive, suggestive and instinctive processes may approach the reflex type of behavior. The latter resembles a simple, primitive mind, more or less homogeneous, since individual traits are suppressed. Those qualities that give distance between individuals under normal conditions are not operative in the social-mind. The philosopher and his servant, the lawyer and his clerk, the prince and his valet are for once psychologically equal. There is much evidence showing that the theological dictum which declares that all men are equal in the sight of God when they are assembled in a worshipping congregation is psychologically true. Cardinal Gibbons said "We all have divers pursuits and avocations; we occupy different grades of society, but in the house of God all these distinctions are levelled."

The causes and conditions produced by the modern church service leading to the formation of the social consciousness are many and potent. Church communicants enter their accustomed places of worship controlled practically by the same feelings, purposes and aims. The entire church service tends to unify their feelings and sentiments. They are expected to occupy the same seats throughout the service, to sing the same songs, read the same responses, repeat the same prayers and rituals, perform synchronous movements in rising, sitting down and kneeling, attend to the same scriptural reading and to give ear to the same sermon. Perhaps one of the strongest factors in suppressing the rational processes of mind and in diminishing the sense of self is the limitations imposed by church worship upon our voluntary movements. Sidis in his work on Suggestion remarks that "nowhere else except in solitary confinement are the voluntary movements of men so limited as they are in a crowd; and the larger the crowd is the greater is this limitation, the lower sinks the individual self. Intensity of personality is in inverse proportion to the number of aggregated men." Stiff and tight fitting clothes, and particularly clothes that restrain the movements of the arms and the use of the hand, contract the sense of self.

So common is this cramped feeling in the case of the hands that it has become a figure of speech. The expression "his hands are tied" describes absolute inability to act in either private or public life.

Although the limitations of voluntary movements imposed by the secular crowd and secular conditions are many and strong, those induced by the church service seem to be more intense. The individual's voluntary movements are not only limited by the number of the crowd and his Sunday apparel but by what may be termed "church manners," an unwritten code of deportment that is impressed upon us from our earliest childhood. It requires that our limbs shall be kept quiet and that our body shall be erect and stationary. The use of the voice is prohibited except when participating in the services. The observance of this unwritten code of manners exercises continual inhibition and produces monotony; conditions which highly favor the receptive state of the social consciousness.

The suggestibility of the social consciousness is a well established fact. Besides the factors already mentioned which tend to create a suggestive state in a church audience, there remains to be mentioned the place of worship and the universal respect and esteem accorded to the clergy.

Places vary markedly in their effect on the mind. The Washington monument and the tomb of Washington arouse thoughts and feelings that have but little in common. Picnic grounds provoke a hilarious, joyous mood; a cold stormy day and a fire in the open grate induce a reflective mood. And likewise the church, with its massive walls, high ceilings, mural designs, decorated windows and heavy stillness creates awe and reverence and magnifies credulity. In this connection one writer observes that church worship reduces distracting ideas to a minimum by means of the restful seclusion which the church affords from disturbing sensations and week-day interests; and this is no doubt assisted by habit, according to which certain surroundings and motions tend strongly to produce the states of mind with which they have been associated. A clergyman of some twenty years service tells me that his efforts to conduct public worship for nearly a year in an opera house were well nigh fruitless owing to the incongruous situation and its appointments.

Again there is a strong tendency to become credulous in the presence of a man of wide knowledge and of large achievements, who can



speak *ex cathedra* on a subject of some moment. Witness the reflex mental attitude of an audience to a lecturer on liquid air or wireless telegraphy or radium. The preacher, by reason of his cloth, of the traditions that cluster about the profession, of his individual worth and works, throws his audience into a suggestive or reflex mental state. With this view of the nature of the mind of a conventional church audience I turn to a consideration of the nature of the stimulus.

Psychology abundantly shows that there exists a special adaptation between the sensory apparatus on the one hand and the stimulus on the other; for example, air waves vibrating within certain numerical limits affect only the auditory sense organ, while odoriferous particles affect only the olfactory sense organ. In general, to secure a definite reaction one must have regard for the nature of the stimulus and for the peculiarities of the sensory apparatus. This principle applied to the present subject indicates that desired reactions depend on fitting the stimulus (the sermon) to the reacting organism (the church audience). The commonplace dictum, "fit the sermon to the crowd," expresses the thought provided that the term, "crowd," connotes all that is meant by social consciousness as above described. In order that the sermon may be effective, then, it must appeal to the social consciousness induced by the church service rather than to that of the individual. I anticipate a question at this point. May not the minister, if he choose, direct his remarks to an individual in the audience? This seems highly improbable for two reasons. In the first place, the minds of the several individuals merge into the social-mind to which individual remarks do not appeal. The minister who, during his discourse, attempts to establish individual relations with a member of his audience with a view of administering reproof or what not, finds to his regret that the relation was not established and that the individual in question interpreted the remarks as addressed to the audience. Booker Washington asserts that his argumentative efforts are attended with greater success if he directs them to an individual in the audience whom he feels holds views contrary to his own. He states that he has noticed the combative individual yielding to his views as the argument advanced. (See his work, "Up from Slavery.") There is no good reason for thinking that Dr. Washington is deceived in this latter particular, but, as already indicated, the conditions preclude the establishment of individual personal relations. The yielding and conversion of the combative

individual was doubtless due to his high state of suggestibility and of contagion caused by the crowd presence and crowd conversion together with the nature of the stimulus (the address), which, under the circumstances, must have been simple, popular and general rather than complex, technical and special.

Furthermore, the speaker does not speak out of an individual mind. It is evident that sensations and the simpler perceptions are individual personal experiences, and that they are not shared; while, on the other hand, emotions and sentiments are common and social, they are shared experiences and may be propagated. For example, color blindness, sensations of pain, of taste are individual matters, they are not propagated; while pride, envy, joy and enthusiasm are shared and propagated. The Russian psychologist, Losskij, observes in this connection: "Almost every lecturer, teacher or preacher has experienced moments when a whole audience listens with bated breath and becomes transformed into a single being *which is immediately connected with his own being.*" (Italics are mine.) I have been conscious of this condition in my own classroom when fortunate enough to present a point with axiomatic clearness. Getting en rapport with an audience means psychologically identifying one's self with the crowd self. It is unification of all the selves present. Tarde<sup>1</sup> points out, "To look at a flower or a mountain or a tree one can forget one's self in the object." But one cannot do so when one looks at an audience. I cannot see the audience without being conscious that it sees me. Furthermore, the social-mind is one of emotions, sentiments and ideals and since these are shared and propagated it follows that the speaker is influenced by them. They are echoed back to the audience in bits of inspiration common to every pulpit and platform. Quintilian<sup>2</sup> says, "There would be no eloquence in the world if we were to speak only with one person at a time." I conclude, therefore, that the minister could not if he would direct his remarks to an individual mind.

I now turn to a further consideration of the nature of the stimulus. It has been pointed out that definite reactions depend upon a specific adaptation between the stimulus and the nervous mechanism, that specific parts of the nervous mechanism demand particular stimuli to

<sup>1</sup> Tarde, Gabriel: *Inter-Psychology*, Intern'l Quar., Vol. 7, pp. 73-5, 1903.

<sup>2</sup> Quintilian: *Monroe's Source Book of the History of Education*, p. 464.

call forth the response. We have already described the reacting organism (the social-mind) as highly suggestible, thinking in concrete, vivid images, dominated by emotions, sentiments and prejudices, void of the critical judgment and of the faculty of logical reasoning. The social-mind, like the child-mind, steers clear of logical thinking. It will have none of it. It would seem, then, that the sermon, to be effective, must be simple, fundamental, vivid, concrete, suggesting and creating images, social, civic and religious. History justifies this inference. The essentials of the great world religions have been spiritual and philosophical in their nature and contents, and beneficent in their influence upon those who were able to appreciate their precepts. This appreciation was necessarily limited to a comparatively few learned individuals. And so long as the religion remained in this pure, spiritual, abstruse form, the number of its communicants continued small. To reach and influence the unlearned, the spiritual truths were cast into concrete tangible moulds out of which came objects of worship fashioned to the comprehension of the secular mind. The degradation of the pure religion followed. Idolatrous, materialistic and commercial practices arose. But the masses had a religion which they could appreciate and were willing to support. It appears that no religion has escaped this materializing process. It was a psychological necessity, comparable to sticks and blocks as aids to number work in the primary grades. We are not to believe that these images, symbols and other material forms constituted the essence of religion: they served as aids to the mind in picturing the real objects of worship.

The saving grace of the christian religion is the fact that its corner stone is a personality. The common mind has ever been able to construct for itself definite images of His life and works. The secret of His marvellous power over the lives of men is due to the infinite number of concrete images and sentiments that cluster about His life; for example, feeding the five thousand, blessing little children, healing the sick, denouncing hypocrisy, overcoming temptation and finally dying on the cross. Peter, on the day of Pentecost, provoked his hearers to ask a life and death question by picturing to their minds the recent events in the Saviour's life and his heavenly dwelling place at that moment. Peter the Hermit, threw all Europe into an hysterical frenzy by picturing to his audiences the sepulchre of Jesus in the hands of his enemies.



Luther's defense of primitive christianity before the Diet at Worms will ever remain an inspiring object lesson to Protestants.

Further evidence of the effects of sentiments is seen in the response of the secular social-mind. These sentiments, prejudices and images may be touched off by a mere symbol, word or phrase. The word "union" had electrical power in the northern states during the sixties, the French crowds were converted into veritable mobs by the watch-words, "liberty, equality, fraternity." The sentiments and prejudices suggested by these words grew out of fundamental and vital issues, forged in political and social upheavals. The conditions that formed them have passed away, but their effect upon the social-mind still lingers.

The effective sermon must stimulate fundamental sentiments in human nature, formed by forces operating over a wide extent in space and a long duration in time. The great divines of the world have preached such sermons. It is related that Phillips Brooks preached a sermon with marked success to the inmates of the penitentiary of Charlestown, Mass., and on the following Sunday used the same theme with equal success as a baccalaureate sermon to the graduating class at Wellesley. Paul at Mars Hill began his sermon by an appeal to an old and fundamental sentiment of the Greek mind. He complimented them upon the many evidences of their religious spirit. The Sermon on the Mount touches only fundamental and living themes; conspicuously absent are theological dogmas and philosophical discipline. I am persuaded that a study of the world's great sermons would show that they were addressed to the universal and fundamental in man, sermons which might be translated into any language and read with profit by any people.

With this view of the nature of the sermon and of the mind to which it is addressed, I turn to consider briefly the reactions and responses of the congregation. It would seem that the reactions might be anticipated with some degree of certainty. To the extent that the preacher speaks out of a social, common, universal mind to a similar mind in the audience, to that extent may we anticipate uniform results,—uniform in the sense that any audience would have so responded. Doubtless the first mental responses in the reaction series are mostly intellectual, and these are gradually superseded by emotional, inspirational and

sentimental; while the later and final processes crystallize into a motive which issues ultimately in some form of conduct.

These somewhat *a priori* conclusions, when their verification is attempted in the concrete, are sorely tried. Securing reliable evidence and isolating it from vitiating factors is here a difficult task. One can conceive of an unprejudiced super-mundane observer seizing and teasing out from the tangle and mesh of church influence those exerted by the sermon only, setting them forth properly evaluated and duly labeled. In default of such gifts one must plod along with the crude and more or less uncertain methods of personal observation, private interviews and formal questions supplemented by the small but growing literature on the subject. The formal questions distributed by the writer were as follows:

Age? Sex? Are you a church member? How long? Please state in what ways sermons affect and benefit you?

Thirty individuals answered these questions. No count has been kept of the interviews. The answers come from all the evangelical churches; five are not church members. Attention is called to the maturity in age and to a long church membership in many cases. The returns fall into three leading classes; first, those who are indifferent toward the sermon but may attend public worship for conscience sake or even for secular reasons; second, those who are critical of the sermon and rarely if ever fuse with the social consciousness; third, those who react in an emotional way, who are caught up and form a part of the church atmosphere. Of course this small number neither affirms nor denies any of the principles discussed above; it simply serves as an introduction to this phase of the subject and creates a desire for more evidence.

Representative cases of each of the three classes are here represented.

### *Indifferent.*

1. Male, 29 years. Non-church member. "I cannot say that sermons affect and benefit me in any way to be distinguished from the way in which I am affected by hearing or reading any other discourse or piece of composition. Sermons as a weekly performance become unbearable to me."

2. Male, 24. Non-church member. "The sermons that I hear, and hear them not very regularly, help me not morally nor spiritually to any great extent. They of course do me no harm. I think people can get a great deal more good out of reading—I mean reading of the true sort, of literature as has been handed down to us and which has lived and will live, than by listening to some of the sermons."

3. Male, 22. Non-church member. "I have been raised in a Christian family and brought up an habitual church-goer, but being associated with far different people at present, church going has almost dropped out of my life. For worldly pleasures are stronger, and sermons as a rule seem too dry to affect me. Yet for conscience sake I attend church, and while there often wish I were back again in the old Christian life and resolve to do better. But resolutions are broken when six week-days intervene and Sunday comes around with only one meeting attended and half the sermon lost."

The returns and my interviews show that there is a growing class of indifferent church goers, both men and women (probably more of the former), educated, cultured, of refined instincts, for whom the sermon has no message or appeal. I find a similar group among laboring classes, particularly those who work in factories.

#### *Critical.*

4. Female, 33. Church member, 18 years. "Whatever the minister's subject, if he is deeply interested in it himself and preaches from the heart, it seldom if ever fails to thoroughly interest me also. If a man himself is not fired with the spirit and feeling of his subject how can he impart it to others? This is often the cause of failure in ministers. They go into their pulpit in a half-hearted way trying to entertain the people and expect to see in response an enthusiasm which they, themselves, do not possess."

5. Female, 33. Church member, 21 years. "The effect of a sermon on me depends much upon the sermon itself, and upon the man behind the sermon. Sermons of a sane, sensible, wholesome type, dealing with conduct and life's practical difficulties, are helpful to me. They encourage me and stimulate me to perseverance in the spiritual life. I like sermons on spiritual themes. I care nothing for a political sermon founded upon current history, or ancient history either. The so-called "up-to-date" sermon dealing with themes furnished by the newspaper columns or by science is to me an abomination, and stirs me always to rebellion against the man in the pulpit."

6. Male, 34. Church member, 12 years. "In a majority of cases I leave the church feeling sorry for the misguided preacher that has tried to teach the people; in some instances I find that the preacher cares more for the peculiar dogma he is trying to promulgate than for the Master he claims to serve; in some cases I am strongly impressed with the evident sincerity of the preacher, my faith is made stronger in both God and man. *Good* sermons *do* benefit me in that they tend to hold me in the path of what my understanding calls right. They strengthen my faith in the Bible, God and the Resurrection."

7. Male, 37. Church member, 25 years. "Most sermons make me weary. Too many of them are mere words that have no concrete meaning. Most of them make statements which I do not believe. I like sermons which set forth the philosophical side of sin. One of the best I ever heard was upon the book of Job. It set forth Job's attitude toward sin as that of the Jews. Another good one which I heard twenty years ago was upon the question of conscience: Is there an absolute conscience or is conscience relative? Many sermons of this kind I can remember almost completely. But most sermons leave no thought with me that will stick."



8. Male, 39. Non-church member. "If the preacher seems charitable (liberal) in his views and is sincere, his sermons always benefit me in that they inspire and encourage, even though they may not instruct. The exhibition of sincerity and charity always strengthen my own better motives and aspirations. On the other hand if the preacher does not appear to be, or is obviously not, sincere I feel injured. Or if he be sincere and lacking in charity (as above defined) I may feel injured or disturbed and not inclined to hear him again. I prefer, of course, to listen to a cultured man, but much prefer the uncultured and sincere to the learned insincere or the learned who lacks in those human qualities of heart and mind which give a man the right to assume to help others."

"The service, the worship, appeals to me more than the preaching, ordinarily, and I often feel that the time spent in the church would have been altogether well spent but for the sermon. Being in the church with other people, all in a worshipful mood, and reverent attitude of body and mind, produces better results upon me than does the sermon. When the sermon seems a proper part of this portion of the service, as sometimes happens, the whole service is far more beneficial and approximates the ideal conditions in such matters. It causes me to feel more satisfied to be among men."

9. Male, 58. Church member. "The sermons of the present day, in great majority, are nothing more than a sort of one-half hour talk to entertain."

Both the indifferent and critical classes rarely, if ever, enter into the social consciousness of the church audience. If they do, it is through the religious atmosphere created by the church service as a whole. They may profit by the services until the sermon is reached (see case 8), which for them is a sort of signal for the critical attitude. This in turn dissolves them out from the social mind and cuts them off from its benefits. The critics, if they react at all favorably, do so to the church service as a whole and the reaction is emotional. Adverse criticism may be made against the subject of the sermon, or against its treatment or against the minister himself. And in the latter insincerity is most often mentioned as a defect.

#### *Emotional.*

10. Female, 31. Church member 17 years. "The practical side of a sermon always helps me. I have heard many of the best preachers in the country of all denominations. Sermons have been the greatest blessing in my life."

11. Female, 19. Church member 3 months. "When I come out from church after hearing a sermon I usually feel much better than I did when I went in, but sometimes I feel disappointed with myself. Listening to a good sermon brings me nearer to Christ and gives me strength and inspiration, and also makes me more determined to live for Him."

12. Female, 26. Church member 15 years. "After listening to a sermon I always resolve to try to live a more exemplary life, a life such as would influence others to become christians. Good sermons soften me and make me more charitable toward my fellow men and ashamed of my ungratefulness."

13. Female, 59. Church member 43 years. "Sometimes sermons make me feel very unworthy of the name of christian, and other times I feel like I want to strive harder for the right, and search the scriptures more diligently to satisfy my own mind."

14. Female, 36. Church member 23 years. "It gives me stronger and better ideals and acts as an inspiration. Sometimes points me to duties I had not realized before. Often brings out Bible characters in a new light, makes them alive so that their reaction on me is that of one human being on another. Occupies one hour of my time in a good and wholesome way. Rests me by taking my mind from my daily tasks, from plans for making one dollar do the work of two, from fixing over old clothes, etc."

15. Female, 27. Church member 16 years. "Sermons have encouraged me, perhaps because my inward eyes have been turned away from myself and toward God; among such sermons I remember especially one from Ps. 27:1 (The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear?) preached when I was a little girl. Another from Luke 5: 5 (Master we have toiled all the night and taken nothing; nevertheless at thy word I will let down the net). Sermons have sometimes helped me to see certain truths which I had not thought of before, have often made me feel the mean and unprofitable character of my own life as contrasted with the life I might live and have in this way been an incitement to greater earnestness. I think this result is usually due to the personality of the minister felt through his sermon."

16. Female, 34. Church member 18 years. "A thoroughly interested consecrated minister, full of the spirit and with a burning message for his people is sure to affect and benefit his hearers. I have often been fortunate in hearing such sermons as these and they have done much to make my life better and happier."

17. Male, 54. Church member 36 years. "I have no use for any sermon that fails to present the personal Christ, freed from everything that detracts from love of the Father and obedience to His will."

18. Male, 37. Church member 25 years. "The sermon makes definite and sometimes more human the spirit and atmosphere of worship. It often, and if good at all, leaves a definite thing to do after getting from the room."

19. Male, 24. Church member 7 years. "I have never before considered this subject, but as I look back over my life, I can see where sermons have benefited me. Many a time a thought that was only in the crudest form developed under the influence of a sermon which probably did not have any connection with that thought, but contained the germ of what was needed to bring it out to its fullest form, and I thereby derived a benefit in that the thought was completed, whereas, if I had not heard the sermon, it would have passed out of my life, leaving no influence behind."

Over fifty per cent. of the returns indicate an emotional response and this tallies with the results of my personal interviews. The expression "I had never thought of this subject before" (see case 19) indicates the non-critical attitude. A sermon by the emotionally disposed is accepted as a matter of course, it is something to be respected, given ear to, to be understood and applied. The critical attitude says the

worship would have been good had the sermon been omitted, the emotional attitude says the sermon makes the spirit and atmosphere of worship more human. The emotional class often lay stress upon the intellectual benefits of a sermon (see above cases on this point). Sermons remove doubts, blocks, sordid debris and inhibitions of whatever sort, and permit the free flow of mental processes; and while this sort of thinking will not classify with the profound or ultra intellectual, it is free, swift, intuitive and being accompanied with instinctive and emotional impulses, results in inspiration, encouragement and accumulated zeal. This group is uniform in testifying to the moral effect of the sermon. The effect of presenting the personality of Jesus is often dwelt upon. This squares with my theoretical discussion above. The social and common mind reacts best to concrete images and personalities. Jesus was religion in the concrete, *i. e.*, religion issuing in daily conduct and being.

#### SUMMARY.

##### I. *The Psychology of the Sermon Presents Three Interrelated Factors.*

(a) Nature of the consciousness addressed by the sermon. Theoretically it is social as opposed to individual. In real life it is partly social, partly individual, and even in the same person the states of consciousness may change from *individual* to *social* and back again repeatedly during the same sermon.

(b) The reaction of the consciousness, theoretically, is intellectual, dominated by emotions and sentiments culminating in a motive. In real life it may be indifferent or critical or emotional and sympathetic resulting in a motive.

(c) The stimulus (the sermon) in nature and purpose, should be common, popular, fundamental, concrete and universal, fraught with images pertinent to the larger experiences of the people.

##### II. *Some Inferences from the Psychological Point of View.*

(a) The sermon is justified as a part of church worship on the ground that the social-mind is more receptive than the individual-mind; it is more likely to be inspired, uplifted, and morally energized. The sermon is informational and directive in that it focalizes motives and intentions on concrete situations.



(b) The emotional sympathetic minds fuse more easily with the social-mind and therefore best react to the stimulus of the sermon, while the critical minds remain apart, isolated, and are easily bored and wearied.

(c) The sermon has lost and is losing much of its stimulating power. This is likely due to the lessened authority of church and clergy—thereby decreasing their suggestive and semi-hypnotic power, and also to many other rival sources of information—the church was once the only source. Its function is doubtless shifting from the polemical and didactical to that of giving comfort and exercising *rational* control over the passions of men.

## THE ORIGIN OF CIRCUMCISION.

By REV. ARTHUR E. WHATHAM.

In Smith's Dictionary of the Bible (Circumcision), we are told that circumcision was peculiarly though not exclusively, a Jewish rite, enjoined upon Abraham, the father of the nation, by God."

Nothing beyond the above is said as to the significance of this rite, except that it was a token of the covenant established between Abraham and God. In view therefore of the statements, first, in the Ency. Bib. (Circumcision), that it is a "well ascertained fact that circumcision was in no way a practice peculiar to the Israelites," and, second, in Driver's "Genesis," p. 189, "circumcision is not, as is sometimes supposed, a rite peculiar to the Jews;" we may dismiss Smith's Dic. Bib. as entirely out of date on this subject.

Schaff-Herzog-Ency. Rel. Know. (Circumcision), tells us that the probability is that the Israelites adopted the custom from the Egyptians. It adds, however, that in its adoption by the Israelites, it cannot be brought "in connection with the idea of sacrifice (as a remnant of an ancient self-sacrifice, sacrifice of the body, castration in honor of the Deity, etc.), since sacrifice means the selection of something pure for the service of God," but to the Israelites the foreskin was the token of human impurity.

These writers, however, fail to tell us what the significance of the rite actually was, beyond a religious ceremonial purity based upon the idea of bodily cleanliness. But this expresses merely a surface view of Israel's conception of circumcision, consequently, it does not go back far enough into the origin of this rite even with Israel. Thus with Smith's Dic. Bib. we may include Schaff-Herzog as out of date also on this subject.

In McClintock and Strong's Cyclo. Bib. Lit. (Circumcision), we read that "Circumcision served to separate the people of the Jews from the rest of the nations, as a people set apart to God." It was announced by God to Abraham as an obligatory continuance of a covenant sign, embracing his entire posterity. These writers argue that the opinion

that the Israelites had this rite from the same source as the nations around them, "involves no peculiar difficulty, since Jewish institutions are a selection, revision, and re-enactment of an older patriarchal religion." Respecting the meaning of circumcision with the Jews, they add that it had two significances, first, consecration to God; second, mental and spiritual purification. Finally, they adopt Ewald's opinion that circumcision was an offering to God.

Practically this is all these writers tell us of the actual origin and significance of circumcision in use among the Jews, consequently, they fail to throw any light on the origin of this rite as practiced by the Israelites.

In the *Ency. Brit.* Prof. Cheyne informs us that the most scientific theory of circumcision is that which refers it to "a religious instinct common to all nations though not always expressing itself in the same way, and this seems even to be at least obscurely indicated by the traditions of the Israelites. . . . The principle of substitution was familiar to all ancient nations, and not the least to the Israelites." Then Dr. Cheyne refers to the offering by the latter for the redemption of their first born. "On this principle," he adds, "circumcision was an economical recognition of the divine ownership of human life, a part of the body being sacrificed to preserve the remainder." Finally, he contends it was even more than this. "It can scarcely be doubted that it was a sacrifice to the awful power upon whom the fruit of the womb depended, and having once fixed itself in the minds of the people, neither priest nor prophet could eradicate it."

There can be no doubt that Dr. Cheyne approaches very near to the origin of the rite of circumcision even with Israel, yet he fails to arrive at any definite conclusion. He tells us that this rite is a religious instinct common to all nations, but he does not tell us how, or why. He asserts that with Israel it was a substitutionary sacrifice, a part of the body given in lieu of the remainder, yet he gives no hint as to the relationship of the remainder to the part sacrificed. It is true that he finally adds that circumcision was a sacrifice to the awful power upon whom the fruit of the womb depended, but he fails to inform us as to the connection between the fruit of the womb and part of the body sacrificed. We are left therefore to work out for ourselves the origin of this rite upon mere hints which any real student of the subject could have propounded equally with Dr. Cheyne, consequently, his article is not of



any particular value to the scholar, and of no value to the general reader.

Dr. Benzinger in the *Ency. Bib. (Circumcision)*, informs us that while there are indications that the Israelites practiced the rite of circumcision from very high antiquity, yet it was in no way a practice peculiar to them. As for its significance not only amongst the Jews, but also amongst most other peoples, it was regarded as a ritual tribal mark. The former attributed to it the effect of accomplishing a sacramental communion, bringing about a union with the Godhead, originally circumcision and sacrifice serving the same end. Finally, he informs us that "The receiving of the tribal mark is a condition of connubium (*Gen. 34*). Amongst the Israelites also it was the marriageable young men who were circumcised (*Jos. 5:2*). Thus, with the Israelites, circumcision was a token both of tribal union and marriageability.

This is practically all that we are told by this writer, so that he also fails to explain the significance of circumcision both as a tribal mark and as a sign of marriageability. Thus we are no nearer the origin of this rite as practiced either by Israel or other people.

Prof. Macalister, in *Hastings' Dic. Bib. (Circumcision)*, informs us that in this rite there was the twofold idea of a sacrifice to a tribal god, and the marking of his followers so that they may be known to him and to each other. The sacrifice is a representative one, a part given for the redemption of the rest."

This also is practically all that we are told of this rite by Dr. Macalister, so that he too fails to inform us as to the origin of circumcision as practiced by ancient Israel, or any other people. Neither does he say anything as to the significance of the redemption of the body by the offering of a part in sacrifice, nor yet anything as to the relation of the remainder to the part sacrificed.

I have now quoted from the five leading bible dictionaries, together with the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, with reference to the origin of circumcision, and I have shown that not one offers any definite opinion as to the origin of this rite either with Israel or any other ancient people. I shall, therefore, attempt this myself, but before doing so, it may be well for us to consider first, the rite of circumcision as the sign of the covenant made between Yahwe and Abraham. That the latter looked upon the phallus as peculiarly sacred to the Deity, is seen by his instructing his servant to place his hand under his thigh—literally upon

his organ of generation—when taking oath to him (Gen. 24: 2-9). “The sacredness,” says Dr. Selbie, “attached to this organ in primitive times, would give special solemnity to an oath of this kind (HDB-Thigh). That Abraham viewed this organ as especially sacred to Yahwe, is further seen in the rite of circumcision as given by Yahwe to him as a mark binding him and his posterity to Yahwe in sacramental union. Circumcision is essentially a sacrifice, and in the selection of this particular rite as a sign of the covenant entered into between Yahwe and Abraham, we see a sacrifice of a part of the body for the redemption of the remainder, as professors Cheyne and Macalister word it. But these writers, as I have said, failed to intimate the relation of the remainder of the body to the part sacrificed, leaving the reader to imagine how much of the body bore a special relationship to the part offered, whether indeed it was not the whole of the remainder. The sign of the covenant made between Yahwe and Abraham, supplies their omission, since by this episode we see plainly that the remainder of the body redeemed by the sacrifice of the foreskin was the phallus, as representing the organs of generation.

We are fortunate in possessing a complete illustration from modern primitive people of this sacrifice with its implied redemption or preservation.

Crawley, in his “Mystic Rose,” quotes from Sir A. B. Ellis, that amongst the Yorubas and Ewe peoples of Africa, circumcision is based upon the idea of sacrificing a portion of the phallus to preserve or ensure the well being of the remainder. This rite they further connect with the worship of Elegbra, a deity associated with sexual matters.

With most primitive people the phallus has been viewed as the organ specially representing deity, the reproductive life which emanates from, and is controlled by, the Creator. It was so with Abraham and his posterity for many generations. Later in their history, the origin of circumcision, the sacrifice of a useless part of the organs of reproduction for the preservation of the remainder was forgotten, and the rite survived merely as a sign of religious ceremonial purity. Prof. Cheyne was right in his statement that in the rite of circumcision we have a recognition of the awful power upon whom the fruit of the womb depended, but he did not tell us also that this rite further contained a special recognition of the owner of the male organs of genera-

tion. It is this which the rite of circumcision specially signifies, and yet we have to go behind this for the origin of this rite.

In the index of Prof. Barton's "*Semitic Origins*," one of the most suggestive of recent works on the subject, we read, "Circumcision originated in primitive Ishtar worship. 98 ff." When, however, we turn to this and the following pages, it is not easy to find the explanation of circumcision, which we are there told is to be found in certain conclusions which are themselves confirmed by the rite of circumcision. On page 98, we are further told that "Circumcision . . . is usually explained . . . as embracing the twofold idea of offering a sacrifice, . . . and furnishing a tribal mark," but there is here no explanation of this sacrifice, or why this particular tribal mark was selected. On page 100, we read that the rite of circumcision as performed in Arabia points to its origin as "a sacrifice to the goddess of fertility, by which the child was placed under her protection, and its reproductive powers consecrated to her service." On the same page we read, "Originally circumcision seems to have been a preparation for connubium. Its transfer to infancy may, as W. R. Smith suggests, have been a later development. Circumcision thus seems for the Semitic people a fitting explanation, and an explanation not out of harmony with that usually given by modern scholars for other peoples." But what is Prof. Barton's explanation? So far it is this: Circumcision is a preparation for marriage, in which the goddess of fertility is recognized by sacrificing to her the prepuce of the male organ of generation, by which sacrifice the reproductive organs of the circumcised are dedicated to her service. But how does this harmonize with the explanation of circumcision offered by modern scholars? These, as I have shown, see in circumcision the sacrifice of a part of the body to redeem the remainder. Dr. Barton, however, makes no mention of this redemptive feature of circumcision, although it is quite possible that he had it in mind, and intended it to be recognized by the reader. He is so exceedingly clear as a rule, that a careful reader of his magnificent work prefers to think that any oversight is with himself rather than with the author of "*Semitic Origins*." In the present instance, however, I must confess I am doubtful, since, on page 110, Dr. Barton tells us that "originally the spring festival of the mother-goddess was accompanied by the sacrifice of maiden virtue, out of which grew the custom described by



Herodotus, and the sacrifice of the foreskin of youths." He nowhere says anything about circumcision originating in the idea of redeeming more or less of the body of the victim by a sacrifice of a part of the same. It is here, I believe, that the origin of circumcision is to be found, and not in any outgrowth of the sacrifice of maiden virtue.

W. R. Smith informs us that,—“In later ages of antiquity there was a very general belief, that in strictness, the oldest rituals demanded a human victim, and that animal sacrifice was substituted for the life of man.”

Again, “The plan for substituting an offering which can be more readily procured, or better spared, for the more costly victim which traditional ritual demanded, was largely applied throughout antiquity.” This animal substitute for the older sacrifice of the life of man, he shows to have been adopted by the Hebrews, Phœnicians and Egyptians (*Rel. Sem.*, pp. 361, 364, 366).

In the oldest of all the cults of the Ancient World, Ishtar or Tammuz worship, is, I believe, to be found the origin of circumcision. Ishtar was the original mother earth-goddess of all the nations of the Ancient World, mother of the gods, men and vegetation. Her worship as associated with the god of vegetation, Tammuz, had for its object the renewal of the vital forces of nature. In rude society human beings have been commonly killed to secure the growth of crops, a custom extending from India to Egypt. In the annual festivals of Tammuz, Adonis, Attis, Osiris and Dionysius, gods severally impersonated by a priest-king, who originally was put to death during the festival, we have the representation of the decay and revival of vegetation, with rites which the ancients recognized as substantially the same. The men who impersonated the several gods, enjoyed the favors of women, most probably sacred harlots, who also severally impersonated Ishtar, Aphrodite, Cybele and Isis (*Frazer-Golden Bough*, Vol. 2., pp. 124, 241, 245, 258, 115, 135; Vol. 3, pp. 166, 178). All this Mr. Frazer tells us, and yet it appears to me that, in company with other scholars, he fails to see here a perfectly plain development of the original sacrifice of this nature cult as it spread west from the Euphrates valley. Let us see whether we ourselves can be more successful or whether we have set ourselves to describe a mirage whose substratum has no existence except in our imagination.

From certain facts scattered throughout a variety of writings, but

which seem never to have been gathered together under one head, it would appear that circumcision originated in a sacrifice which has undergone two important changes or modifications. In the first instance, a human being had been sacrificed at the shrine of deity. Subsequently, emasculation, the offering of the spoils of manhood, was substituted in place of the victim's life. Finally, circumcision was substituted for emasculation.

The evidence that these three stages were successive steps in one evolution, is as follows:

Primitive man very early pictured the earth as the mother goddess, the self-producer of vegetation, who, however, was not able to maintain it. Thus, the god of vegetation, who in the first instance, as produced by the earth, was her son, had to be given back to her as her husband, in an annual sacrifice for the purpose of reanimating the earth's waning vitality. It was this conception which produced the legend and worship of Ishtar and Tammuz, the original Semitic nature goddess and god, a worship, which, as I have said, underlies all forms of this myth.

With primitive man all nature was peopled with spirits, whom he viewed as gods. They were originally chthonic, *i. e.*, of the earth, identified with objects and powers belonging to the earth, while clothed with human forms and capable of exhibiting every human action in passion and appetite (Barton-Sem. Orig., p. 81; Teile-Elements in the Science of Rel., Vol. 1, p. 92).

The first deity conceived by the Semites was Ishtar, the mother earth goddess (Barton-Sem. Orig., Index, Mother-goddess). This was but natural, since man's observation must have been first aroused by the necessity of food. This he saw in the annual vegetation, apparently the natural and unaided product of the earth. To him the earth became the primitive mother, and the vegetation her son. At all events, we knew that the early Semite did view Ishtar as the mother earth goddess who produced the annual vegetation (Jastrow-Bab. Assy. Rel., p. 563). This vegetation he further viewed as her son, and also her husband, Tammuz (Barton-Sem. Orig., p. 85; Cheyne-Bible Problems, p. 74). The next step was the recognition that the mother earth while possessing inherent power to produce fertility, could not maintain it, as evidenced in the annual decay and death of vegetation

(Jastrow-BAS, p. 574). She thus became responsible for the death of her son Tammuz (*ib.*, 483).

Prof. Barton informs us that "Many scholars agree that Tammuz was in some way connected with vegetation, and that the legend of his death was a reflection of the dying of the leaves (Sem. Orig., p. 85). Tammuz was indeed connected with vegetation as he was impersonated by it, as we see in the weeping and rejoicing at his festival, which related to his death and resurrection as portrayed in the decay and revival of vegetation. As Ishtar was personified by the earth and its powers, so Tammuz was personified by vegetation and its growth (Barton-Sem. Orig., pp. 86 ff., 112 ff.).

I have said that the early Semite viewed Tammuz not only as the son of Ishtar, but also as her husband (*cf.* Sayce-Bab. Rel., p. 251; Jastrow-BAR, pp. 84, 484), and I shall now show why.

I have already referred to the belief that the earth goddess was not able to maintain her own power of fertility. This had, consequently, to be stimulated. But by what?—and how. Naturally, by contact with male powers of fertility, and these could only be given through some process by which the barren earth could literally absorb them.

Prof. Barton informs us that primitive Semitic religion was organized on the analogy of its economic and social life (Sem. Orig., p. 83; Ellis-Psy. of Sex., Vol. 2, p. 101). I have already referred to Frazer's statement that in the cult we are considering, two persons, a man and a woman, represented the god and goddess who were impersonated by the vegetation and the earth. "The operations of nature," he further tells us, "were supposed to be carried on by mythical personages very like man himself." If he could only assimilate himself to them completely, he would be able to wield all their powers (Golden Bough, Vol. 3, p. 164). Further, the sympathetic relation supposed to exist between the commerce of the sexes and the fertility of the earth, to which he alludes, explains the licentiousness accompanying the worship of Ishtar and Tammuz, since we see that it was seriously regarded as aiding to maintain the earth's fertility.

From all this we gather that by a mimic marriage of the earth goddess and god of vegetation, impersonated by two human beings, it was believed that the earth's vitality would be restored. This accounts for Tammuz being viewed as the husband as well as the child of Ishtar, for,



as the god of vegetation, which again was viewed as the offspring of the earth goddess, he was both son and husband of Ishtar.

This festival, however, included more than a mere mimic marriage. Vegetation annually decayed and died, consequently, Ishtar was viewed as causing the death of her son-husband. In the carrying out of this thought during the progress of the festival, the man who played the part of Tammuz was originally slain, and his body burnt, while his blood and ashes were mingled with the earth in token of the literal uniting of the earth goddess and the god of vegetation in marriage.

Mr. Frazer, after presenting many illustrations of the sacrifice of human beings to promote the growth of crops, tells us that there is "no improbability in the supposition that they may once have been killed for a like purpose in Phrygia" (Vol. 2, pp. 238-248). Considering that the custom of human sacrifice was common throughout Semitic heathenism (Ency. Brit., Vol. 16, p. 696; HBD, Vol. 4, p. 334), and in view of the evidence already given, it seems to me that human sacrifice lay at the root of the Ishtar cult, indeed that this cult cannot be explained apart from it. Prof. Sayce shows that the sacrifice of children in substitution for their fathers, was well understood in Babylon (Bab. Rel., p. 78; Patriarchal Palestine, p. 183), which shows that human sacrifice was known in the Euphrates valley as well as in other regions where the Semites dwelt. I believe that originally in the Ishtar cult, the man representing Tammuz was put to death. Prof. Barton thinks that Tammuz was viewed as Ishtar's son in accordance with the primitive Semitic belief that the head of the family is the mother, and the chief male her son (Sem. Orig., p. 85). I believe, however, that Tammuz was viewed as the son of Ishtar owing to the Semitic conception of the origin of the mother earth goddess, who by her self-produced vegetation appeared to them as a virgin with a child, which child was a male, since it was thought to have become the husband of Ishtar, by whom it was afterwards put to death.

In this conception, I believe, also, is to be found the origin of human sacrifice amongst Semitic and other people, a sacrifice lying at the base of circumcision and the first step in the development we are tracing.

As time advanced, many substitutes were offered in place of an adult human victim. Now it was a male child who took the place of the father, again, it was some lower animal offered as a substitute for the child, or person (Pausanias, Bk. 9, c. 8), but the victim was always to be a male

(Ex. 34: 20; Barton, *Sem. Orig.*, p. 251). This development of the original sacrifice we can already trace in the history of the Hebrews. That the early Israelites, like other divisions of the Semitic people, offered adult human sacrifice we see in the death of Jephthah's daughter, slain and offered by her father as an offering to Yahwe in accordance with an oath taken to that effect. At one time there was an effort made to deny that this incident recorded a human sacrifice, but scholars are generally agreed that this is the meaning of the narrative (Judges 40, Sayce-*Early His. Heb.*, p. 52, Moore-Judges, p. 299; Jephthah, EBD; *Ency. Bib. HBD*, Kent-*His. Heb. People*, p. 96).

W. R. Smith (*Rel. Sem.*, p. 416) is, consequently, justified in seeing in this episode a connection with an annual sacrifice, but he does not enter into the reason why a virgin should be sacrificed to Yahwe. It seems to me that here we have a similar idea to that underlying the sacrifice of male victims to goddesses, here it is a female victim to a god, a common enough episode in ancient times (Pausanias, *Bk. 4, c. 9*), and one undoubtedly connected with the sex idea underlying all the varied cults of Ishtar.

Returning to the OT, we have David uniting in offering innocent human beings in sacrifice to Yahwe, who is represented as accepting them by way of atonement (2 Sam: 21, 1-14; Kent, *His. Heb. Peo.*, p. 204; Sayce, *Early Heb. His.*, p. 440; Rizpah-HBD). Outside the Israelites we see amongst other Semites the evolution of the substitution of the child for the parent, as witnessed amongst the Babylonians (Sayce, *Bab. Rel.*, p. 78; *Patriarchal Pal.*, p. 183), a custom undoubtedly followed by the Hebrews themselves. Notwithstanding their supposed law against the sacrifice of children, the OT gives abundant evidence that such a sacrifice was of regular and common occurrence (Eze. 20: 26; Budde, *Rel. Israel to the Exile*, p. 62; Sayce, *EHH.*, p. 47). With the Hebrews, as with their neighbors, the first born, even of children, was claimed by the tribal deity, for Yahwe had declared that all such were his (Ex. 21: 29), but that they were to be redeemed by the payment of five shekels a head (Ex. 13: 13), although W. R. Smith says that the idea of animal sacrifice as a substitution for the life of man appears amongst the Hebrews in the story of Isaac's sacrifice (*Rel. Sem.*, p. 366).

When all the facts are borne in mind we cannot blame the Hebrew people for the sacrifice of their children, notwithstanding the law

against it (Deu. 13: 31; Lev. 20: 2). The supposed sacrifice of children to Moloch before the captivity was really an oblation to Jehovah (W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.*, p. 372). Brought up from infancy in the belief that the first born of every family, if a male, was sacred to Jehovah, and to be redeemed by five shekels, they knew that he had graciously waived His right to the life of this firstling for a mere five shekels. They might well argue that God would, after all, be better pleased if they refused to take advantage of His consideration, and in place of such a paltry sum, devote, instead, their first and best beloved child (Frazer, Vol. 2, p. 46). This belief, says Sayce, "was consecrated by the Mosaic law itself" (EHH., p. 47).

Amongst the Phœnicians of later date, it was not long since discovered that the ram was a recognized substitute for a former human adult victim (Sayce, EHH., p. 52). Amongst the Hebrews, also, it was customary to offer this animal as an atonement for both priests and people, and there can be little doubt that as with the Phœnicians, so with the Hebrews, this creature was a substitute for an older human sacrifice.

But while amongst the Semites the life of the human being was redeemed in the manner described, there was still required a part of his body to be offered in sacrifice in token of what the substitution stood for, and as a continual reminder that, after all, the man himself was the property of the deity. To this end, as a substitution for the entire life, the victim surrendered his manhood by emasculation, such surrender being viewed as an equivalent to the entire life of the victim, since the life called for was the reproductive life. Had we not the witness of Lucian to the offering of the virile powers to the Syrian goddess at Hierapolis (*De Syria Dea*), together with the record of numerous similar mutilations throughout Asia Minor (*Ency. Bib.*, Phœnicia), the presence of eunuch priests at the shrines of all female deities, in Egypt, Babylonia, Phœnicia, Syria, and Asia Minor, would of itself have intimated the origin of this loss of manhood.

The mutilation of the young lover ascribed in one of the versions of the Attys legend, to the furious jealousy of his divine mistress (*Attys*, *Ency. Brit.*; HDB., Vol. 1, p. 605), had its origin in the surrender of the virile powers to a mother goddess, a feature in the worship of the latter which explains the presence of eunuch priests at the various shrines of the Ishtar cult.

The Galli, or eunuch priests, who served the shrine, and on public



occasions led the chorus of the devotees of Cybele, the goddess who had mutilated Attys (Ency. Brit-Persinus; Smith's Dic. GRA-GALLI), are commonly said to have had their origin in the cult of this Phrygian deity. But castration as a feature of this worship did not originate in Asia Minor, nor yet with the Syrian Semites, as Perrot and Chipiez evidently imagine (His. Art in Phrygia, p. 212). Cybele was but another and later form of the Hittite goddess Ma, worshipped at Komana in Cappadocia, and served by 6,000 eunuch priests (Perrot and Chipiez, *ib.*, p. 30; Wright-Hittite Rel., p. 75; Sayce-Bab. Rel., p. 267). But the Hittites, like the Canaanites, imported both their deities and their worship from Babylonia. The worship of Cybele and Attys was accompanied by the rites with which Ishtar and Tammuz had been honored in Babylonia (Wright, *ib.*, pp. 73, 75). The Hittites, in their stronghold of Carchemish on the Euphrates, had adopted the Babylonian cult of Ishtar and Tammuz-Adonis, and had handed it on to the tribes of Asia Minor. The close resemblance to the story of Attys and that of Adonis was the result of a common origin. The old legends of the Semitic cult had come to the West (Ency. Brit.-Lydia). From Babylonia the Hittites had borrowed their art (Hittite-Ency. Bib.), so that we are not surprised that they borrowed their religion also. Prof. Sayce tells us that the Kali, a class of Semitic Babylonian priests, are the "Galli or eunuch priests of the Kappadokian goddess, their religious name having been borrowed along with the religious rites over which they presided (Bab. Rel., p. 62). Ishtar herself had been served by eunuch priests (*ib.*, p. 266). In fact, 'the man' or 'creature of Ishtar,' is called Kalu, *i. e.*, one of the Galli" (*ib.*, p. 225).

From all this evidence we cannot be wrong in viewing emasculation, or the surrender of virile power to the mother earth goddess, as having originated in Babylonia as a substitute for the life of the entire human victim.

I will give one more illustration, and then I will sum up as far as I have gone.

In Ex. 4: 25 ff., we read that when Moses was returning to Egypt in company with his wife Zipporah, and son Gershom, Yahwe met him and sought to kill him (because he was uncircumcised), but Zipporah saved him by circumcising their son (Moses, HDB; Ency. Bib.).

That the story represents Yahwe as seeking the life of Moses, who was only saved by his wife in the manner described, all modern scholars

admit. But how was this done? By substitutionary sacrifice, *i. e.*, Moses's son was circumcised in the place of his father (Ency. Bib. Circumcision).

The meaning of this passage, says Prof. Barton, is that Moses himself being uncircumcised, Yahwe tried to kill him, but he was saved by his wife circumcising her son in his stead, and smearing some of the blood upon Moses so as to make it appear that the blood proceeded from an incision in him, and that then Yahwe was appeased (Sem. Orig., p. 280). This make-believe is referred to by W. R. Smith as largely applied throughout antiquity (Rel. Sem., p. 364). Of course the entire episode is a legend (Peters, Early Hebrew Story, p. 191), yet it serves to show us the evolution of human sacrifice in early Israel. Here we have a substitutionary offering in a part of the body of a child being sacrificed instead of the father. This evidence, added to that already produced, shows us three stages in human sacrifice. First the man himself; next a substitution in the sacrifice of his child, or an animal; finally a second substitutionary sacrifice in the circumcision of the child, the death of an animal, or payment of five shekels.

But this is not the evolution we are directly seeking, although this is interesting, and it has necessarily been evolved in our search for the evolution of sacrifice as affecting the original victim himself. Here I have shown two stages. First, the sacrifice of the entire adult victim; second, emasculation of the adult in lieu of the entire victim. Can we show a third stage?

We are fortunate in possessing direct evidence that circumcision was a substitution for human life. Eusebius informs us that a plague having occurred, Cronos sacrificed his only son to his father the Sky, circumcised himself, and obliged his companions to do the same (Sayce, EHH., p. 46). Nothing could possibly be plainer than the inference to be gathered from this statement, *viz.*, that circumcision on the part of Cronos and his companions was offered as a substitutionary sacrifice in place of their own lives, the actual life being supplied in the sacrifice by Cronos of his own son. Of course all this is legendary, yet it serves to show an evolution in the idea of human sacrifice, and justifies those scholars who see in circumcision a sacrifice of a part of the body to preserve the remainder.

But what idea lay behind the offering of a part of the sexual organs as a substitution for the life of the victim? Surely here is a survival

of a rite once common wherever the cult of Ishtar, the mother earth goddess, was the religion of the people. That Yahwe was the author of life, who manifested himself especially in all matters of reproduction, is the belief expressed repeatedly in the early narratives of the OT. But this alone would never have suggested the idea of the phallus being his special representative organ, nor of the sacrifice of part of it to redeem the rest. I believe with Prof. Barton that Yahwe was a transformed mother goddess, which at once explains the difficulty, and brings the early Israelites into harmony with the common belief of the Semitic world in its adoption of the Ishtar cult (Sem. Orig., pp. 280, 287).

In early times it had been customary to offer the whole male victim to the earth goddess. At Sparta, Lycurgus changed this idea into the practice of flogging young men before the altar of Artemis, which thus became sprinkled with human blood (Pausanias, Bk. 3, c. 16). The thighs of victims were specially offered to Aphrodite (*ib.*, Bk. 2, c. 10), the well-known goddess of illicit love, who is equivalent to Astarte of the Hebrews, and Ishtar of the Babylonians. The thigh is the seat of life, especially procreative or virile power, as appears very clearly in the idiom of the Semites (W. R. Smith, Rel. Sem., p. 380). Male victims were offered to the Oriental Aphrodite, her favorite being the goat. Smith's suggestion that this preference was connected with the androgynous character ascribed to the Eastern goddess (*ib.*, p. 472), fails to bring out the real significance of this preference. This is to be found only in the assumed necessity of devoting to her the virile or reproductive powers. This fact recognized, we at once understand why the Ephesian Artemis is represented with many breasts, and why she was served by eunuch priests (Smith's Class. Dic. Artemis). This fact explains why the Celestial Aphrodite, the same goddess as the Ephesian Artemis, has one foot on a tortoise; and the Pandemian Aphrodite sits on a he goat (Pausanias, Bk. 6, c. 25). These two creatures are well-known symbols of virile or reproductive power, and being thus associated with Aphrodite, her reproductive character is emphasized. In Yahwe's origin as a female deity, we see all this expressed in the final offering to him of the foreskin as a representative and substitutionary part of the organs of generation, or, in other words, as a substitutionary sacrifice for the virile power of the victim. Of course all this had long since been forgotten when the stories of the nation came finally to be written, yet the hints which are so plainly given, and as plainly



not understood by the writers, are to us unmistakable survivals of a forgotten religion once practiced by their ancestors.

The sacrifice of the entire victim having been the first method of securing the benefits of fertility from the earth goddess, or rather ensuring *her* the continuance of this fertility, what was more natural than that in the process of substitutionary sacrifice, emasculation should take the place of the victim's life, to be followed subsequently and finally by circumcision. If, as it seems probable, circumcision is a substitution for the whole victim, we can well understand how it originated as a substitution for emasculation, since the very nature of the rite suggests a connection between the organ sacrificed in part or whole, and a female deity.

Thus, for the reasons advanced, it appears to me that circumcision had its origin in nature worship, the Ishtar cult, as the outcome of the evolution of a sacrifice offered in primitive times to a mother goddess, first, the whole victim, then emasculation, and finally circumcision. If I am not correct, why do modern scholars see in circumcision a sacrifice of a part of the body to preserve the rest? Why, if I am not correct, was the foreskin chosen as the part of the body to be sacrificed to redeem the remainder? The conclusion which I have come to in my research tends to explain and confirm the opinion of these scholars, whose view otherwise appears to me to be without any definite foundation.

Finally, I will add that I do not of course maintain that this evolution was orderly or consciously developed, or indeed that in any centre of worship of the mother earth goddess these three stages can be successively traced. On the contrary, it is merely by a general survey of the entire regions where, and the people by whom, this nature cult was adopted, that we can see this evolution as I have described and traced it.

## LITERATURE.

Luigi Valli, *Il fondamento psicologico della religione*. Roma, ERMANNO LOESCHER e C, 1904.

According to its preface, it pretends to be a work of scientific psychological research based on history. The author finds three problems to solve: (1) What is the idea common to all religions? (2) How can the existence of this idea be accounted for? (3) How did it develop into the various forms to be found in the historical religions? (p. 19). After about a hundred pages of referring to, and criticising, all sorts of philosophy of religion, Valli realizes that he has to go his own "solitary way," cutting loose from all abstract conceptions and studying religion as a psychic phenomenon (p. 100). *Ut desint vires, tamen est laudanda voluntas*. He does not cut loose; he believes to have ascertained at least two facts, (1) that the idea essential and common to all religions is the idea of the good being in reality superior to the evil, and (2) that this idea, although contrary to reason, arises from the very desire which it satisfies, after the logical functions of our mind have been impaired for the time being (p. 112). At this point, he begins to generalize in his own way, from a scanty array of facts, according to the speculative method of the philosophers of religion which he so much dislikes.

The religious phenomenon is, in his opinion, made possible: (1) by the classification of all things under the heads of Good and Evil, which this psychologist tells us underlie our likes and dislikes; (2) by that two-sided arrangement of our mind according to which each painful idea (*rappresentazione*) arouses a counter idea (*controrappresentazione*) of a corresponding good (p. 126); and (3) by those four indefinite regions (?) in which the realization of those counter ideas does not seem to run counter to human reason: unknown powers, the inner character of these powers acting upon human welfare, the future time, the transcendent world (p. 131). The religious moment itself then consists, he goes on speculating, in an emotion produced by a new or a rather deep vision of pain or of existing outward evil; an emotion which is, psychologically speaking, ever the same, be it produced by fear of an imaginary evil spirit or by lack of food, by shipwreck, by oppression, by the vanity of human pleasures and so on (p. 137). This emotion disturbs the cognitive or logical function so that the difference between the actual and the possible is dimmed and the mind is enabled to assert the reality of the counter idea: that is, to have faith (p. 152). This "*salto irrazionale*" of the religious process is later on more impartially called *extrarational*, but that such a term is at all chosen, shows the author in an unsympathetic mood toward his subject-matter and bars his speculation from being benefited by an even individually limited knowledge of the cognitive character of the religious moment; which is first of all the expression of the restored health of the psychophysical constitution and a reasoning from analogy to personality which re-interprets life at least to the satisfaction of the reasoning individual concerned.

But to return to Valli's argument! The *salto irrazionale* of the religious process appears in four forms according to the four reasons mentioned above: (1) By "*contraposition*" the evil is thought a power which is weaker than another kind power. (2) By "*mitigation*" the evil is thought the aversive mood of a superior being which may be overcome by the kind disposition of the same being. (3) By "*aspettazione*" (a certain way of looking at things) the evil is thought a transitory state followed by a just and happy future; and (4) by "*irrealizzazione*" the evil is thought an illusion, a negligible quantity hiding an eternal kind reality (p. 151).

This is all the psychology there is; the very language used by the author is the opposite of concise—I tried to improve that part of it—and shows his innocence regarding things psychological. And yet he all the time scratches the surface of big veins of gold. He sees that religion is best studied when focused in a psychic

moment, that the religious moment is first of all an emotion sweeping the field of consciousness, that the moment is a vision, that during the moment the logical function is impaired; but he does not study these things from biographical records; descriptive and statistical research is an unknown quantity to him; he goes on speculating as his many references have done before him and often makes things worse when he, for instance, fights Schleiermacher the originator of religious psychology (p. 100), regarding his feeling of absolute dependence.

To show what I expected him to do, I will here sketch in a few words the results that the analysis of the religious moments of various individuals yielded to me and which are partly verified by the work under the auspices of Clark University. The results are here given as I formulated them for my lectures on the Psychology of Religion delivered before Meadville, Pa., Theological School, November, 1903.

Lecture I: The spiritual vision as basic Experience for religious thoughts, emotions, and volitions.

1. The comparative method is indispensable for the Psychology of Religion, but must be complemented by the most thoroughgoing individual analysis.

2. The spiritual vision appears after the crisis of puberty at about 16. It is to unify the psychophysical constitution by producing faith in the ideals subliminally formed; it completes its growth during the second half of adolescence when attempts at life's work are made.

3. The spiritual vision presupposes the birth of self during boyhood and girlhood: Fits of abstraction and systematization, characteristic of that stage, lead up to the consciousness of individuality and refractory conduct. The number of these cognitive moments seems to decrease inasmuch as the spiritual visions increase.

4. Conditions favorable for the functioning of the vision are, those that paralyze the primitive impulses: religious intoxication, religious symbols, religious thoughts, misfortune, coming in touch with nature, etc.

(5) The unifying restoration of the psychophysical constitution, which appears psychically as a degree of satisfaction, precipitates into consciousness as an optimistic view of life, which may be indicative of the most active or the most passive conduct of life. (*Cf.* the Teutonic and Russian ways.)

(6) The visionary perceives himself as illumined space with nature sharing the same immateriality; he identifies the perception of unity between himself and nature in various degrees with God, and deduces either Pantheism or Panpsychism by automatic reasoning from analogy to personality.

(7) This cosmic emotion, which involves a paralysis of the selective functions of selfhood, merges into the emotion of humbleness, that is, of being but a part of, and absolutely dependent on, the majestic and sublime universe or the omnipotence back of it, which is perceived as a more or less purposeful God.

(8) The selective emotional function of likes and dislikes being paralyzed, love appears as the communistic emotion of an individuality that awaits being fitted into the work of the universe of spirits; where, however, it will be either impaired (Mediterranean, Mongolian races) or regulated (Northern European).

(9) The selective volitional function, that is, the will to acquire individual power and to reject that of others, is deadened during the vision and replaced by the impulse to self-sacrifice. In the reorganization of life it appears either impaired as communistic will (Russian and Latin monks, Nirvana), or regulated as society-centered individuality (the Anglo-Saxon, New Thought movement).

(10) The fact that there are people with small degrees of the spiritual vision, or even with none at all, suggests to the evolutionist the task of educating the race into a complete possession of the function. The pedagogical method to be employed is to be established by Ethics and Practical Theology.

E. TAUSCH.

#### NOTE ON RACIAL DIFFERENCES IN SPANISH RELIGION.

The American Review of Reviews of last April gives the sum of an article in the *Revista Contemporanea* (Madrid), by Dr. Emilio Ribera, under the heading "Greek Types Preserved in Spain." The people of Denia, Sagunto, and Burriana, in the former kingdom of Valencia, are said to be physically and mentally different from the people of other communities close by, which the author considers to be the



results of a mixture of the Arab, Castilian, Aragonese and Moorish elements left by successive conquests. Up to quite recent years, they would not intermarry with these neighbors. The isolation is also manifest in their pronounced dissenting religious views. Until lately, Burriana had but one church while Villa Real had many. Masonry, almost unknown elsewhere in the region, has flourished there, and protestantism, introduced by the English, has only in these towns gained a relatively large number of adherents. Dr. R. thinks inquiry would disclose other similar centres on the east coast of Spain.

But why should Greek descendants be more prone than other Spaniards to accept protestantism, to favor democratic brotherhoods, to believe in religious individualism and guard against degeneration by intermarriage with neighbors considered to be inferior? Were the Greeks so very particular in these respects after the Persian and Peloponesian wars had eliminated the northern stock of the older society of European Greece? Or are the Greeks of to-day differentiated from the rest of the Mediterranean peoples by the traits credited to that anthropological isle in Spain? Surely not! Thus the label "Greek" does not account for the differences mentioned above, but the notice goes a long way to verify an interpretation of them which has been of late attempted by anthropologists as F. Ratzel, L. Wilser, Gustav Ratzenhofer, O. Ammon, M. Much, Houston Chamberlain and others. The Northern European, whose relatively pure type is described in the *Germania* of Tacitus, and is still extant on the Scandinavian peninsula, in some parts of England and on the northern coast of Germany, has in some way or other, may be through natural selection exercised by the stern demands of glacial periods in prehistoric times, reached a greater psychophysical perfectibility than either the smaller Mediterranean or the round-headed type who later crowded in between the two former. By greater perfectibility I like to understand possibilities of growth beyond those of lower races in two directions.

(1) The Northern European is better able to adjust the environment to his ideals of self-assertion, or, what is the same, his biological needs. The Dorian, Æolian, Ionian in Greece, the Latin in Italy, the Teuton of 400 A. D. in Italy, France and Spain, they all were able to advance the civilizations they had found; it is true, indeed, not before they had in the slow course of centuries assimilated these civilizations. Or look at the portraits of the leaders of the Renaissance in Southern Europe! You will easily recognize their anatomical relationship to the Teutonic type and understand the interpretation that the revival of learning about 1500 and modern science came into existence because at that time the northern stock, settled in those latitudes, had finally assimilated all the civilization or assistance toward a happy life that Rome could offer. Then a thousand more perfectible brains busied themselves with observing the environment in which man strives to be comfortable, with discovering and inventing more such devices helpful to increase the length and contents of life. This modern civilization of ours has been in the main created and is still being created in the northern latitudes because the Teuton has been almost eliminated from among the Mediterranean and round-headed stock of Southern and Middle Europe. Witness the centre of industry moving from France to England and Northern Germany at about 1850.

And (2) the original Northern European is better able to adjust his personal conduct to his ideals of self-assertion or biological needs. The Mediterranean believes in ethical dualism, in beggary and poverty, in the asceticism of the monk, in the natural unholiness of the married estate, in the necessity of a celibate life for any one who wants to be on intimate terms with a holy God; he believes in all that because he is not able to regulate his primary impulses or functions of self-assertion, so that they may serve as a means to their biological end, without becoming themselves the purpose of life. The Northern European, on the contrary, believes in ethical monism, in the holiness of labor and industry, of civilization and the comforts it offers, in the holiness of matrimony, in the spiritual worth of all biological functions and of the whole individuality; he believes in all that because he is able to regulate his impulses and activities so that they are always contributing to the physical and spiritual increase of his own life and to the outward realization of the spiritual universe. For instance, he is able to organize his sexual life without degrading himself and his wife; he does not need to deaden like a celibate any of his functions to live a holy life; he does not impair the individuality of a man or woman to fit them

for holy service within society. Witness the ideals of Luther, the Greek ideal of the golden mean, the individualism of the Anglo-Saxon, the abolition of a superior priesthood, the consequent freedom of thought and conscience, and the New Thought movement.

If this is a possible interpretation, we understand psychologically why in those Spanish villages, protestantism has gained a large number of adherents, why heretics have always been numerous, why the villagers did not intermarry with their neighbors; it is because they belong to that northern stock that was still dominating Spain before the inventors of a higher civilization were burned up by the fires of the Inquisition down to 1650.

Now if there are more such anthropological isles in Spain, then the practical conclusion for the Anglo-Saxon missionary must be that he is to begin the evangelization of the country at these points. This would be just as necessary a conclusion as the other that no Spanish statesman can hope to advance his people to the lines reached by nations that are still being led by a dominating number of Northern men as the United States, England, Germany, Austria, France; even Russia has a better chance to catch up with modern civilization, as long as she has not completely eliminated by war or revolution the Teutonic stock.

Ohio University, Athens, O.

E. TAUSCH.

*Prolegomena to the Study of the Greek Religion.* By JANE ELLEN HARRISON. Cambridge (Eng.), University Press, 1903. pp. 680.

The author urges that Greek religion is not mythology nor seen in the literature of that country as is popularly supposed. As what people do is more important than what they think, we must turn to ritual which no English work has yet attempted to examine thoroughly. Homer is wrongly thought primitive. He is, especially in religion, the apex of a long development of which we are given few traces of origins. Below his splendid surface lies a stratum of rites of purification, once atonement, which show that the Olympians were not primitive and which reappeared in the dramatists later.

1. Of the two Greek rituals the Olympian or Homeric follows the principle *do ut des*, I give that you may give. Sacrifices to the gods are to obtain their favor. The banquets to which they were bidden are shared by the worshippers. There is no fasting or cleansing. Thucydides, the old oligarch, identified piety with games. Even Euthryphro, who believed piety was giving and asking or transacting a *quid pro quo* business with the gods, giving each his due, would not represent the Homeric view point. In such transactions man obtains the best because the gods are greatest, but toward the Olympians there was no fear, no skepticism, no sense of sin. The sacrifice was roasted to make it palatable and because the gods were in heaven.

2. The Chthonic rites were very different. Here the holocaust was devoted entirely to the gods, was not shared. These services were gloomy and were on the principle *do ut abeas*. I give that you may go away. If in these festivals garlands were worn the face was pale. The ceremonies were thus of riddance, exorcism, and to avert evil. The Ouranians looked up, the Chthonians looked down. The first was Archean, the last the faith of the primitive Mediterranean folk, perhaps the Pelasgi. Thus Ruskin, who said the Greeks knew no fear but were calm before fate; and Thucydides, who defined religion as rest from toil, were both less representative than Plutarch who, in his fear of the supernatural, would say nothing unless good of the gods and declared he would rather people should say that Plutarch never existed than that he was bad.

The old Chthonian rituals were chiefly three, or may be grouped about three, which were typical, as follows:

(a) The Dasia. These were originally collective sacrifices and constituted a spring festival. They later purported to be to Zeus Meilichios the Avenger. But this is a superposition of cults and the service itself was far older. Its spirit is chilly Stygian gloom. Pigs, as the cheapest animals, and sometimes sheep, were sacrificed to the under world as whole burnt offerings symbolizing complete renunciation. Angry ghosts demanded placation and must have all or nothing. The service was nocturnal, without the need of temple or grove, was sometimes used after wars to purify from the stain of kindred blood. In these rites Zeus is often figured as a snake or has some serpentine attribute or symbol. In fact, Zeus had expelled an

ancient snake god with a widely scattered cult in many a parish and precinct and had appropriated the rite to himself. In Mr. Ferguson's "Tree and Serpent Worship" the dead hero often takes the form of a snake. Sometimes those purified by these rites preserved or stood upon the skin of their victims. The service was always downward, suggesting Hades or Plutos.

(b) The Anthesteria. This was also a spring festival named from the month which corresponds to the last of our February and the first of March in the Greek calendar. It was a ritual of ghosts and sprites. New wine was broached and the first poured as a libation with a prayer that it might do good and not harm. There were revels for two days, like the Pardon in Brittany, where servants and children were free from restraint for a time. This was, perhaps, before Dionysos. The gloomy side of this festival, however, was both larger and more ancient. It was to lay ghosts and sprites, a kind of all souls' day when the mental and moral house-cleaning was done. Afterward the shades were thrice bidden to depart as in Russian festivals now ghosts are told to go. They hie to clefts, chasms, old wells, or graves, to taste dead men's food and suggest Hecate. It was a *dies nefastus*, and the precautions were apotropaic or warding off. Buckthorn was chewed as a purgative to make clean within. Walls were smeared with pitch to keep off ghosts and there were many later ætiological stories invented to give reasons for customs older and more persistent than their rationale. Out of grave jars as well as wine jars souls often fly on old friezes and paterae, etc. The rhabdos was first the magic wand of the enchanter of the dead and signified the rule of the manes and only later became a royal scepter. The root of purification is the ghosts' desire for vengeance and blood for blood. Probably these rites were not all those of aversion but there is some tendence. In one cut the head of Teiresias rises out of the earth to the conjuror, revived and recalled by the blood of a black ram. Sacrifices at heroes' tombs were often of blood rather than wine, or trenches were dug for wine and honey in which a dead ram was placed. The vindictiveness of ghosts surges up by night to avenge false oaths, and especially bloodshed, as later they were developed into erynīs that woke for ravine. It was all a ritual of fear. The bodies of enemies were mutilated to weaken the power of their ghosts. Perhaps their blood was taken in the mouth and spat out. Euripides vainly tried to see in these ghosts only bad conscience. It remained for Orpheus to accomplish this development. Ordinary winds needed no explanation, but peculiar or strong ones were the breath of the under world gods, came from tombs, and perhaps called for expiation. The entrails of men were best for the mantic art, and those races who neglected the sacred office of dance and feast had no other purpose to meet than for fighting, and sank to barbarism. Oaths were taken perhaps standing on slices of killed animals and praying down to low altars, or in the dark that the sun see not. In murder, the next of kin to the dead could slay the next of kin to the slayer that the ghost of the dead man might drink blood and thus be laid. These altars, perhaps primitively caves or pits, were often subterranean or perhaps omphalos shaped. The ghost wanted blood to slake a spiritual thirst but later, as customs grew mild, could be fooled with foul water. In early days the victim's blood was poured on the suppliant. Later fillets of wool worn by the victim were symbolic of his sacrifice. To name the dead stirs their wrath. Taboo was what was sacred to gods but forbidden to man. They became, therefore, holy. Thus the anthesteria was originally a feast of all souls and involved fasting, but later was developed as a Dionysian revel.

(c) The Thargelia were more primitive and plain, in the early summer, and intended to purify in order to receive the first fruits. The pharmikos stood for physical and moral purgation in order to promote and conserve fertility. In classic times this was sacred to Apollo. It was the first harvest home, held in May or June, but was more anxious than the festivals of seed time. The first fruits or first loaf very often among primitive people must be taken only after elaborate ceremony. It is a critical time. The main body of the harvest may yet not be gathered. The Calcedonian boar was sent because men forgot it. There were many mummeries pantomiming the increase of flocks and crops by sympathetic magic. It was close time and taboo could not yet be entirely removed. The gods might be jealous. This was one of the Eleusinian mysteries. Sometimes only grass or soft wool were offered, but the gods should not be cheated. But the first fruits of the trees, acorns, leaves, barley, corn, cakes, water, honey, oil and wine were their due. Salted meat,



before salt was known and long after, was unpropitious as unleavened bread to the Hebrews. A kind of barley porridge chopped with olives, leek, rarely with milk, was common and the service of the Eumenides was a wineless one. In the fireless sacrifice the pharmikos was sometimes the human victim laid out, once actually killed, ideally a noble man but often later a degenerate, one of the offscouring of the race, and perhaps a criminal. He was, perhaps, fed with cakes, wild figs, and then even later in times of plague or dire stress, burned with wild wood or fruitless trees and his ashes scattered to the wind and sea. He was often insulted, beaten, and a human scapegoat doomed to utter destruction, not a sacrifice offered to an angry god, not vicarious, but so taboo and infected that he was pollution incarnate. Perhaps he was led through the city, beaten with a cathartic plant or with leather (shoes thrown at newly married pairs). Those who abused him must feel real resentment, and this perhaps led to using criminals, or else the ceremony was not efficacious. He was sacer = argos = sacred, too good, or evil. Later the pharmikos became a magic man presiding over the expulsion of physical evil with drugs. In early days he was sometimes made drunk when killed, perhaps poisoned, but always sacrosanct. Men and animals stood very near, and the latter was soon substituted by man in doing his own moral housecleaning. Oxen were driven about an altar on which lay a meal cake and the ox that stepped up to eat it was doomed. Women held the ax and knife, others sharpened the latter. When the butchers slew the ox they fled but were captured and accused. The women declared their innocence, the sharpeners theirs; the butchers accused the knife and ax of guilt and these latter were solemnly condemned and cast into the sea. The skin of this sericate ox was stuffed and put to the plow in the field and it was pretended that he was not dead but had come to life. Boys who killed snakes fled as did Apollo after slaying the Python. Our Indians sometimes refused to eat green corn until the busk festival freeze it. Bakers and millers have required ceremonies to use it. In May the Romans threw images from the bridge into the Tiber. Once they threw men. Marriage in May was forbidden. The image of Pallas was stripped, washed till it shone, temples and sacred places cleansed, and this housecleaning was all preparatory to bringing in the first fruits, figs leading.

In the Thesmophoria Athenian women, conservative as is their sex, conserved the custom pre-Dorian perhaps Pelasgian, of sacrificing young pigs each fall and bringing up from the snaky chasm the remains of those thrown there the year before to mingle with the seed to ensure a good crop. Very akin were other ancient rites, the arrephoria in which maidens went down at night taking down bundles and bringing others of content unknown but really snakes, the haloa, skira.

All these were germs of the Eleusinian mysteries, a cult almost incongruous to the Olympians. In their old form they recognized evil and sought to avert it by apotropaic ceremonials. There were certain insignificant and magic sacra, which only those who were purified could handle, which helped bring rain and crops, a group of little vessels like muffin cups connected in a circular way, one cup each containing vetch, poppy, lintels, pulse, spelt, oats, barley, beans, wheat, honey, oil, wool, milk, which entered into the festivities of Cybele, the good mother. The mystics who were to celebrate these rites left Athens for the sea with many interdicts to "fence the tables," and celebrated thus a kind of communion, at first purely purgative of evil, but later, under Dionysiac influence penetrated with the new idea that man can become a god by eating a man's body which were these crops and wine. Everything was enormously fluid, fusive, purgative, involving the allayment of baleful influences. Diseases are bad spirits always seeking entrance through mouth, nose, eyes, every natural avenue. They are noisome keries. There were keries of old age and death which could eat the very soul and must be kept at bay; snatchers, harpies, gorgons, wild demons, fates, furies, avengers, euminides, often compounded of keries, while others had passed from ghosts to goddesses or from the dark world to the bright one above, always this background of fear like the Accadian maskim, a sentiment that made those falsely thought to be dead unwelcome. Æschylus first dared to present and form the Erinnys from Homer which to his day had been a formless horror. Slowly other abstractions arose, Dike, justice; Tyche, fortune; Erme, peace; Agathe, goodness. Perhaps these goddesses were made under matriarch influences.

Dionysos was the first great reformer. The Olympians had little influence over

men's lives. Greek orthodoxy made its gods in man's image but kept the two apart. To strive to become even like God was insolence, hubris. Man must think thoughts befitting his own estate and not even aspire to the life of the Olympians.

Dionysos was a Thracian immigrant from the north, the home of spiritual impulses, perhaps, first expelled, then welcomed. It may be after several epiphanies and recessions. On the old worship of gods of the vegetable world he grafted a worship of the spirits of vegetation, typifying by wine and enthusiasm in which physical intoxication, never excessive because the Greek motto was "Never too much," and they always mingled their wine with water, led to spiritual ecstasy. Thus man could pass from the human to the divine. Thus the *moenad* was converted into the muse. Thus the sacramental mystery was felt. Thus a mild abandonment first, perhaps, was some recrudescence of animality, orgiastic and debauch, with Bacchic halleluiahs, with satire, orgies of Thracian origin were developed. The cups from which they drank at the Eleusinian mysteries as reformed by Dionysos were smaller. Perhaps they still tore their kid in two. Their ideals were a return to nature, to the mountain, to a kind of trance-like prophetic state of inspiration of which intoxication was the symbol. All this might have lapsed had it not been for Orpheus and the second new impulse which he very early gave to this movement. To him it was better to be drunk with new ideas, with the madness of the muses, with the inward ecstasy of the ascetic, with the magic of other personalities, and to feel a sacramental mystery accomplished in us all day by day, to fast enough to feel that breaking bread and drinking wine renew spiritual strength, that even the relation of the sexes is better typified by Eros than by Ephrodite. The oath of the Orphic celebrant was, "I fast and am clean from all that makes unclean and from intercourse with——." Perhaps there was mimetic marriage which the church fathers so condemned in these rites. As Dionysos gave the *guerdon* of tragedy, Orpheus set up the *liknon*, the harvest basket, as a symbol of the cradle and new birth of the child Eros. The initiate declared he had carried the *liknon*. Perhaps a torch was put out and the hierophant and priestess "did a saving act in darkness." Marriage and birth were focal acts, symbolic of union with the divine, and perhaps refined from the story of the rape of Persephone. Demeter impelled to the great step from the epos to the drama in the sixth century B. C. The worshipper can now not merely adore but be the god by completely assuming his rôle. It is not strange, then, that the Eleusinian mysteries were often described in the language of the stage.

The Orphic eschatology is seen on the eight thin golden tablets exhumed in lower Italy giving instructions to the dead about their conduct in the lower world. They are incomplete and hard to read. A candidate avows his divine origin. He drinks of the well of memory, not of Lethe. One says, "Bad have I fled, better have I found;" one, to the gods, "I am of your race, I am pure;" one, "I have escaped the wheel," suggesting Buddhism; one, "I was a bush, bird, fish with gleaming scales," and so on. "Death may be life and life may be death." The Orphic cosmogony develops Eros from an egg. The Orphics cared for the past and the future, the Olympians only for the present. They said the last word of Greek religion, and strangely modern it is. They gave us a further determination of the absolute, to love. Bacchus and Eros are the only real Greek gods, just as ecstasy and love are the most potent personages. These things haunt us a little. They are the things forgotten, like the charmed sleepers of romance. If Orpheus hated women, he loved "the boy." The chime of the dancers' feet meant the orderly motion of the stars. It is the real gods that gave our life. Orpheus felt fear but he could worship. The powers above and those below reason thus: non human and perhaps non moral may give us bliss or tear our lives to shreds, while their own serenity remains unruffled. Orpheus's music could stay the torments of hell but he could not have fetched Eurydice for she was not real. He longed back to simple days and ways. He insisted for the irascible on angerless days and ways. It was he and his rite that were parodied in "the clouds." "I walk on air, I contemplate the sun high above earthly mixtures." This meant the Orphic initiation. So does Strepsiadēs, who sits on a stool to commune with God. A thinker waits and wanders. He invokes the gods from the clouds and sky, and so on, to appear wherever they are, naming their haunts.

He made the *hosioi* and order of Delphic priests whose duty it was to test the

fitness of every animal sacrifice. Their prayer was, "Sanctify these creatures to our use, and us to thy service."

Thus in great crises men revert to primitive, simple ways. Perhaps, thus, at Delphi there was sometimes the eating of raw and bloody flesh, and animals torn with the teeth, living or dead, and a gradual amelioration. There was daubing with white clay, "eating of the bull god afresh" (Egyptian imprecation), strange commingling of old and new strata, the snake, bull, child, satyr, minotaur, horned snake, in ways we cannot trace.

Orpheus seems to have been a real man. He has no birth tales, but when a boy was frightened and perhaps bitten by a serpent, but found cure in a temple of the sun. He came, perhaps, from Crete, although more likely from Thrace. His cult suggests Egypt, but the rude and vigorous North is a more probable origin than the more fashionable one of the Orient. Numbers and music belong together, and Orpheus, whose Thracian origin gave him musical proclivities, is depicted as striking his lyre and looking up in an absorbed way. Rocks moved, trees bowed, wild things came, lions, panthers, cattle and sheep as to a good shepherd. He was a vegetarian, abhorred the flute, that makes men mad, and the clashing cymbals. He reformed music or the arts of the muses which Plato thought more fundamental than laws. The Orphic hymns, although less known now, were probably more influential than Homer. He was a great Protestant reformer, hardly separable from Apollo, his work a little like that of Gregory. According to tradition he was killed by Thracian moenads who later became the muses. He did not marry, perhaps abhorred women were not allowed in the precincts where his service was celebrated. Women were conservative and the proprietors of religions, and to be excluded from mysteries designed solely for men may have angered them. They tore him to pieces but his head went to Lesbos, always singing of gods and not like Homer, of men. Sometimes he was only a voice. While he left the sun, tradition sends him to Hades for Eurydice so that he has Chthonic attributes. Nature lamented him most as over the midnight sea the voice came that great Pan was dead. According to one tradition, Zeus slew him. According to another, the men had laid down their arms to attend his service when the women killed him, who were tattooed and tabooed as a punishment therefor later. A lost play of Æschylus describes his death and may have told how the moenads were converted into muses. His cult started not at his birthplace but at his grave, as the blood of martyrs is the seed of the church. His tomb was mantic and here women were debarred. Plato is full of Orpheus as is Euripides whom the church called the prototype of Christ. He no doubt repelled some and attracted others; had a rare charm and magnetism of personality; may have been a solecist, but he brought into order a riotous ritual.

G. S. H.

*The Religion of a Mature Mind*, by GEORGE ALBERT COE. Fleming H. Revell Company, Chicago, 1903. pp. 438.

*Religion as a Factor in Individual and Social Development*, by GEORGE ALBERT COE, published in *The Biblical World* of January, 1904, Chicago.

Professor Coe's now well-known book, *The Religion of a Mature Mind*, has undoubtedly a real contribution to make in the solution of difficulties that are more or less consciously felt by very many thoughtful men and women. The scope of the book is well indicated by the titles of the chapters: "Modern Manhood;" "The Scientific Spirit in Matters of Religion;" "Authority in Religion;" "Some Things That We Know;" "Moral Foundations of Spirituality;" "The Chief End of Man;" "The Right to be Called a Child of God;" "The Breadth of Religious Experience;" "Are Conversions Going out of Date?" "Salvation by Education;" "The Life of Prayer;" "The Consciousness of Sin;" "The Christ of Personal Experience." It will be seen that while the chapters are logically arranged and supplement each other, they still stand in considerable degree each by itself. And each chapter has its own peculiar value, especially in giving reality to the religious experience in terms of the hour, and thus performs a vital service. The whole discussion is characteristically clear, definite, and constructive. The key of the thought of the book is found in this part of the dedication: "A youth complained to his mother that his prayers contained no sure sense that God heard or would answer. The mother replied: 'May not your impulse to pray be God's manifestation of himself to you?'"



As the youth grew to manhood, this hint unfolded into an interpretation of life as a whole. This book is a product thereof." This key Professor Coe uses throughout his discussion. The two chapters that perhaps particularly concern the aims of this *Journal* are Chapters 8 and 10, dealing with "the breadth of religious experience," and "salvation by education."

In Chapter 8, Professor Coe, while recognizing the contribution of mysticism, protests earnestly against the common misconceptions which have arisen from it; in the overestimation of ecstatic states; "in separating the religious faculty from the rest of the mind;" in regarding religious experiences as merely occasional events; that are thus thought of as luxuries rather than as the staple of religious living; and in forgetting the specific dangers which are involved in merely extraordinary phenomena. As over against this whole purely mystical conception of religious experience, Professor Coe sets a contrasting type of religious life, which he thus summarizes: "We have thus traced the sense of God's presence all the way up from ecstasy, through special experiences, to the every day employments of the faculties. The moral feelings, the social feelings, the æsthetic feelings, all appear to reveal God. So does the moral will, and so, finally, does the intellect, in its reverential joy in the truth. This is not speculation, but a description of actual experience. The sense of a divine presence can and does penetrate all human faculties." . . . "In a word, the religious experience is what we should expect it to be if the doctrine of the immanence of God is true." He expresses the same thought in different language, when he says: "Our invitation is rather this: 'Be your whole self! Be completely in earnest with your intellectual sincerity, with your conscientiousness, with your love of fellowmen, with your aspiration for all that is true and beautiful and good, and you will find that a sense of God is the moving spring of the whole!' . . . The religious experience is not something different from living a good life, but is just living it more abundantly." The whole chapter is thus plainly a valuable and needed supplement to the merely mystical conception of religious experience.

In Chapter 10, *Salvation by Education*, "the weak place in the Church's campaign" is felt to be that it has no clear theory and practice of "how God and man co-operate in the education of a soul." It holds that when both are properly understood, modern Christianity and modern education have moved toward each other, and that in this whole movement Horace Bushnell, in his *Christian Nurture*, was the chief forerunner. "This reform centres about the thought that the child is a developing life, whose internal laws of growth prescribe the principles and methods of education." "The present strategic necessity" is said to be centred in this conception: "Salvation by education is a possibility and a fact because education is not merely something that we do to and for the child, and not merely this united with the child's own efforts for himself. God is the central reality of the whole. He is the moving force, the giver of the inner law, and the goal of all human development. Through education he extends his saving grace to the child. This implies that we understand education in no shallow sense." "In all real education, the soul is being unfolded toward God, its source, and its inmost reality." The emphasis of this chapter, too, is a wholesome and needed emphasis.

Professor Coe's article in the *Biblical World*, "Religion as a Factor in Individual and Social Development," is a very solid piece of work, and requires more careful thinking for its appreciation than any of the discussions in the book just referred to. There is very much packed away here in little, for the argument is fundamental, though religion is taken in the broadest and most abstract sense. But so considered, the article shows satisfactorily and most suggestively the unity of religious education and individual and social development. The argument is based directly on present ruling conceptions, and seems to the reviewer thoroughly justified. The fundamental points in the development of Professor Coe's thought may perhaps be summarized as follows: The notion of education in religion presupposes that religion is a normal and vital factor in both individual and social development. If this is true, then not only can there be true education in religion, but any education that leaves religion out is essentially fragmentary and distorted. The test of history shows that religion is a part of culture at every stage of development. And this creates "a presumption that it has a meaning for humanity as such." "The child, the youth, the man responds to environment as though life were more than a

set of relations to visible things and persons." "The child's first notions of the world as a world of persons is a genuine analogue of nature-worship among early men." In the development of the child there gradually springs up "a threefold conception of personality—the self, the parents and other visible persons, and an ideal or standard personality possessed of power, of wisdom, and of moral authority. This moralizing of the ideal answers to the evolution of ethical religions out of nature religions." "Thus, at every stage of the growing life from infancy to manhood, natural desires and impulses, when brought together in consciousness with actual experience, create an ideal conception of personality. We cannot help idealizing life, and the ideal grows with our growth." "This idealization of life is what makes religious education both possible and natural." "Belief in divinity is natural, then, because the idealizing process is a part of man's spontaneous response to his environment," and also because "it merely mirrors back to us what is experienced in our own personality." "From all this it appears that the ideal civilization of human life that begins in infancy and grows with our growth is essentially a religious development." "Religion, then, is a normal fact in the developing of both the individual and the race. But in what sense is it a factor in that development?" "Possibly there is no God, but certainly the reality of things, whatever it is, that manifests itself in our conscious life constrains us to feel and act and think as though there were a God." "Be it nature, or be it God, it forms us individually and collectively; it energizes within us so as to mould us upon the idea of a divine being. In ways both simple and involved, the idealizing impulse is a power in our life. It sets a standard, first for others, and then for the self; and it makes us restless whenever the standard is ignored." The ideal is, thus, "not a mere dream; it is the engine of human progress." "The profound impulses of our nature whence belief derives its power, being the source of our personal and social ideals, are the very starting-point of social and individual aspiration." "Take away the real basis of belief, then, and you take away the very organizing principle of society." "Any reasonable scheme of education, therefore, must have a place for religion. Nay, since religion is the very organizing principle of both the individual and society, it demands the first and controlling position in education."

*The Trend in the Higher Education*, by W. R. HARPER. Chicago, University Press, 1905. pp. 390.

President Harper here reprints twenty-three papers, many of which are addresses he has given on various occasions within the last few years. We do not forget the many volumes lately published by distinguished presidents of colleges and universities older and younger than this author, in saying that nothing in the field of higher education that has appeared in this country is so progressive or so abounds in new and fruitful suggestions. The papers here used are of very uneven merit, from rather perfunctory and congratulatory addresses up to the radically new papers. They are actually attempted or advised concerning the academic secretion of the sexes or the business side of university waste in higher education or the proposed reconstruction of theological education. In the latter subject he points out that in the decade ending 1904 the number of students in permanent theological schools in the North declined from fifteen per cent.; in the Inter-denominational institutes the loss has been four per cent.; in the Congregational Seminaries, forty-three per cent.; among the Presbyterians, thirty-three per cent.; about twelve thousand men who graduated in 1904 from Yale, Harvard, Columbia and Princeton less than thirty planned to enter the ministry. Dr. Harper could name fifty young men of his own acquaintance who within five years have abandoned their original purpose to enter the ministry, because convinced that their work would not be acceptable to the churches. This one factor of uncertainty has in a single year deterred more men from entering the ministry than have actually entered it. "Their educational training has taught them to think and they have experienced the intense satisfaction that comes from thinking. Can they be blamed for refusing it to enter upon a profession in which the great majority of those who have undertaken are forbidden to think except within the narrowest limits?" Again, men cannot look forward to the possibility of educating even the smallest family in the present day upon the average salary of the minister. The world has come "to estimate individual men as well as the profession in forms of commercial

character. It is outrageous that it should be so, but it is so." Again, the dignity of the office has been impaired by the practice of certain denominations who admit without adequate preparation. There is now no adequate presentation of the world's profession from a modern point of view. "Our seminaries are more or less exclusive in their spirit and are thus perpetuating the old priestly ideal which has so often brought ruin both to individuals and nations." They are still too mediæval and remote from modern life. There is a remnant of the old pride strongly mingled with almost craven sense of dependence. "Of Psychology in its modern aspects and of the elementary practice of economic structure, the average theological student is almost entirely ignorant." "To-day many of our ministers and teachers do not even know of the existence of these problems and yet they enter upon their mission with the belief that God is directing their work." Denominations have to-day nothing to separate them and the seminaries should inculcate new doctrine of the church. "Psychology takes the central place in the thought of our time and overflows into the thought and channels of our life.

Very many students for the ministry are now asking if there is not some way of preparing for it other than through the seminary which instead of being what it now is, the place where men are to learn certain views and adopt certain ways to repeat and amplify them, should be a place in which men are taught to think. The man not modern in science "cannot speak effectively on any topic, least of all the subject of religion, to men who have had such training." The ordinary preacher cannot impress the lower class and "the evidence would seem to be quite conclusive that he is equally unable to influence the higher class, this manner increasing rapidly but the church cannot reach them and the seminary cultivates a narrow and exclusive spirit. It is sometimes even located in the country isolated from the activities of human life. The student cannot do good work in the classroom and preach on Sundays, neither should he be deadheaded by free tuitions. "Nothing is more noticeable or more despicable than the utter lack of independence exhibited by a great proportion of the ministerial class." "The specific mission of laboratory work in science is not so necessary for the prospective student as the knowledge of Greek" and if the college does not furnish this equipment the seminary must do so. "The work in psychology provided that the smaller institutions from which the largest proportion of candidates for the ministry came is essentially that which was done fifty years ago." "Modern psychology is to them as yet largely unknown, this system as to psychology applies likewise to pedagogy, the subject, which in its recent application is of vital interest to the minister. Child study is as directly connected with the work of the minister as with that of the teacher, for it is in the transitional age from twelve to eighteen that the work of the church must be done." The new method of studying the Bible must be adopted. For most theological students the time spent in Hebrew is thought wasteful and injurious. The requirement of Hebrew has worked incalculable injury to the morale of many students." Hebrew should be elective in the English Bible and for many be sufficient. Where pupils are required to take Hebrew the quality of instruction is often wretched.

Dr. Harper would encourage specialism; some are practical and cannot be scholarly and for the latter there are many lines of interest and it would be far better for each to give particular attention to a similar group of topics. Sometime courses will be laid out to fit for professorships, for presidencies, for secretaryships of mission societies, for medical preparation, etc. Not more than one-third or one-half the curriculum should be common to all students. Theological clinics should be held for investigating the slums and this work needs medical knowledge. Some time should be set apart for the students to work under the direction of a pastor, just as law students spend some time in office and medical students in the hospital. There should be opportunities for those who desire to spend four years instead of three in the seminary. The first year alone being devoted to a common field. Others might specialize more or less in the Old Testament, in sociology, in music, history, homiletics, etc. Perhaps each pupil selecting a subordinate topic. Hebrew should be required only of those who specialize in the Old Testament or the New Testament, and Greek only for those who are to be preachers or teachers. The latter should give a liberal portion of their time to natural science, psychology and English Literature. All those who are to be pastors and administrators, the



English Bible, psychology, pedagogy should be the chief subjects and no Hebrew or Greek should be required. Sunday School and visitation work should be specialties. There should be intermigration between not only seminaries but of different denominations.

*Early Eastern Christianity.* St. Margaret's Lectures, 1904, on the Syriac-speaking Church, by F. CRAWFORD BURKITT. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1904. pp. 228.

These very scholarly lectures describe the early bishops of Edessa and present an early Eastern development of the Christian church, somewhat gnostic in its character, but very different from that of Western orthodoxy. This church believed itself to have had an apostolic origin, but its theory of life and doctrine is as distinct from ours as is the blood of the race who developed it. This church, as tradition ascribes it, dates back to the putative letter of Christ to King Abgar. The ancient religion of Edessa was a worship of the heavenly bodies. Upon this recent studies have shed much light. We have no time here to epitomize the very interesting and new story set forth in these lectures. The radicalism; the symbolic explanation of certain facts generally, believed in the life of our Lord, from the Immaculate Conception down; the views of baptism and celibacy; the rancor against matrimony as a church office; the peculiar interest attaching to the city itself, and especially to the two great columns on the citadel; the story of Judas Thomas and of Bardaisan; the many colloquies and incidents; and perhaps crowning all, the wondrous hymn which Saint Thomas sang in prison:—all this together opens up a most fascinating new department of early Christian history. The hymn itself, to which no exact date can be assigned, is perhaps the high-water mark of gnosticism. It is as follows:

#### THE HYMN OF THE SOUL.

##### I.

While I was yet but a little child in the House of my Father,  
Brought up in luxury, well content with the life of the Palace,  
Far from the East, our home, my Parents sent me to travel,  
And from the royal Hoard they prepared me a load for the journey,  
Precious it was yet light, that alone I carried the burden.

##### II.

Median gold it contained and silver from Atropatene,  
Garnet and ruby from Hindostan and Bactrian agate,  
Adamant harness was girded upon me stronger than iron;  
But my Robe they took off wherewith their love had adorned me,  
And the bright Tunic woven of scarlet and wrought to my stature.

##### III.

For they decreed, and wrote on my heart that I should not forget it:  
"If thou go down and bring from Egypt the Pearl, the unique one,  
Guarded there in the Sec that envelopes the loud-hissing Serpent,  
Thou shalt be clothed again with thy Robe and the Tunic of scarlet,  
And with thy Brother, the Prince, shalt thou inherit the Kingdom."

##### IV.

So I quitted the East, two Guardians guiding me downwards,  
Hard was the way for a child and a dangerous journey to travel,  
Soon I had passed Maishán, the mart of the Eastern merchants,  
Over the soil of Babylon then I hurried my footsteps,  
And my companions left me within the borders of Egypt.

##### V.

Straight to the Serpent I went and near him settled my dwelling,  
Till he should slumber and sleep, and the Pearl I could snatch from his  
keeping,  
I was alone, an exile under a foreign dominion,  
None did I see of the free-born race of the Easterns,  
Save one youth, a son of Maishán, who became my companion.

## VI.

He was my friend to whom I told the tale of my venture,  
 Warned him against the Egyptians and all their ways of uncleanness;  
 Yet in their dress I clothed myself to escape recognition,  
 Being afraid lest when they saw that I was a stranger  
 Come from afar for the Pearl, they would rouse the Serpent against me.

## VII.

It was from him perchance they learnt I was none of their kindred,  
 And in their guile they gave me to eat of their unclean dainties;  
 Thus I forgot my race and I served the King of the country,  
 Nay, I forgot the Pearl for which my parents had sent me,  
 While from their poisonous food I sank into slumber unconscious.

## VIII.

All that had chanced my Parents knew and they grieved for me sorely,  
 Through the land they proclaimed for all at our Gate to assemble—  
 Parthian Princes and Kings, and all the Eastern Chieftains—  
 There they devised an escape that I should not perish in Egypt,  
 Writing a letter signed in the name of each of the Chieftains.

## IX.

"From thy Father, the King of Kings,—from the Queen, thy Mother,—  
 And from thy Brother,—to thee, our Son in Egypt, be greeting!  
 Up and arise from sleep, and hear the words of our Letter!  
 Thou art a son of Kings: by whom art thou held in bondage?  
 Think of the Pearl for which thou wast sent to sojourn in Egypt.

## X.

"Think of thy shining Robe and remember thy glorious Tunic;  
 These thou shalt wear when thy name is enrolled in the list of the heroes,  
 And with thy Brother Viceroy thou shalt be in the Kingdom."  
 This was my Letter, sealed with the King's own Seal on the cover,  
 Lest it should fall in the hands of the fierce Babylonian demons.

## XI.

High it flew as the Eagle, King of the birds of the heaven,  
 Flew and alighted beside me, and spoke in the speech of my country,  
 Then at the sound of its tones I started and rose from my slumber;  
 Taking it up I kissed and broke the Seal that was on it,  
 And like the words engraved on my heart were the words of the Letter.

## XII.

So I remembered my Royal race and my free-born nature,  
 So I remembered the Pearl, for which they had sent me to Egypt,  
 And I began to charm the terrible loud-hissing Serpent:  
 Down he sank into sleep at the sound of the Name of my Father,  
 And at my Brother's Name, and the Name of the Queen, my Mother.

## XIII.

Then I seized the Pearl and homewards started to journey,  
 Leaving the unclean garb I had worn in Egypt behind me;  
 Straight for the East I set my course, to the light of the home-land,  
 And on the way in front I found the Letter that roused me—  
 Once it awakened me, now it became a Light to my pathway.

## XIV.

For with its silken folds it shone on the road I must travel,  
 And with its voice and leading cheered my hurrying footsteps,  
 Drawing me on in love across the perilous passage,  
 Till I had left the land of Babylon safely behind me  
 And I had reached Maishán, the sea-washed haven of merchants.

XV.

What I had worn of old, my Robe with its Tunic of scarlet,  
Thither my Parents sent from the far Hyrcanian mountains,  
Brought by the hand of the faithful warders who had it in keeping;  
I was a child when I left it nor could its fashion remember,  
But when I looked, the Robe had received my form and my likeness.

XVI.

It was myself that I saw before me as in a mirror;  
Two in number we stood, yet only one in appearance,  
Not less alike than the strange twin guardian figures  
Bringing my Robe, each marked with the royal Escutcheon,  
Servants both of the King whose troth restored me my Treasure.

XVII.

Truly a royal Treasure appeared my Robe in its glory,  
Gay it shone with beryl and gold, sardonyx and ruby,  
Over its varied hues there flashed the color of sapphire,  
All its seams with stones of adamant firmly were fastened,  
And upon all the King of Kings Himself was depicted.

XVIII.

While I gazed it sprang into life as a sentient creature,  
Even as if endowed with speech and hearing I saw it,  
Then I heard the tones of its voice as it cried to the keepers;  
"He, the Champion, he for whom I was reared by the father—  
Hast thou not marked me, how my stature grew with his labors?"

XIX.

All the while with a kingly mien my Robe was advancing,  
Flowing towards me as if impatient with those who bore it;  
I too longed for it, ran to it, grasped it, put it upon me,  
Once again I was clothed in my Robe and adorned with its beauty,  
And the bright many-hued Tunic again was gathered about me.

XX.

Clad in the Robe I betook me up to the Gate of the Palace,  
Bowling my head to the glorious Sign of my Father that sent it.  
I had performed His behest and He had fulfilled what He promised,  
So in the Satraps' Court I joined the throng of the Chieftains—  
He with favor received me and near Him I dwell in the Kingdom.

The meaning is plain. The soul is sent from its heavenly home, there forgets its origin and mission till aroused by a revelation, whereupon it performs the task, returns to the upper region, is reunited to the heavenly robe, its ideal counterpart, and enters the presence of the highest celestial powers. The King, Queen and Vice-roy seem to represent the Trinity. Paul earnestly desired to be clothed upon with a house from heaven. The word "robe" stands for "body." This shows us the true heart of gnosticism in its struggle with early Christianity.

In the Acts of Thomas the Apostle, he is represented as coming to India to build a palace for the king. He was welcomed, shown where to place it, drew its plan, was sent successive installments by the king. He always reported progress and at last only the roof was wanting. Meanwhile all the funds were devoted to healing the sick, casting out demons and doing good works. Thus he was really building a palace. When the inevitable exposure came he was condemned to be burned and flayed alive, but fortunately the king's brother, Gad, died and his soul, after visiting heaven, was able to return and beg the king to assign him the lowest chamber in his splendid palace. This was finally described to the king and was so magnificent that all his anger departed, Thomas was released, and he prayed him only that he might be worthy to enter this palace.



*Sree Krishna, the Lord of Love*, by BĀBĀ PREMĀNAND BHĀRATI. Published by The Krishna Samāj, New York, 1904. pp. 226.

We have here a remarkable book by an oriental pundit, who has spent some time in this country. It is dedicated to his Gooroo, "to whom my soul, mind and body are irrevocably sold, in payment of the grace of his illumination which lighted my path to the lotus feet of Krishna, my beloved." The worst of all superstitions is that our life begins with the birth of the physical body and ends with its death. To believe that we never had greater powers than we now possess is the saddest of all mistakes, while the most inspiring of all creeds is that we were once great as the deities and can recover that greatness. This faith in the potentialities of the human mind can make life a long ecstatic song. Krishna and the author have always loved each other, for both came from the primeval ocean of love when all was one essence. Our forgetfulness and separation is the cause of all trouble and pain. We must struggle back to full, complete, absolute satisfaction, from the original source of which the universe has sprung. This original abode of joy the Hindu calls "Krishna," which means "to draw." Krishna draws us to itself by spiritual gravitation. Thus, true pleasure cannot be found in material objects or in anything outside ourselves. We yearn for this lost state of the soul. There are really twenty-four steps down from Krishna to earth, and twenty-four back, beginning with the senses. Every particle of this cosmos is conscious in every point of bliss it has once left. God is formless, and yet has a form. Thus, the writer goes on to discuss the concrete and abstract God, the science and steps of creation, the golden, silver, copper, iron age, the caste system, the stages of life, the deluge, the kalpa cycle. Dissolution shows us how science upholds the shastras and describes the physical and astral body, karma, the atom's return journey, Yoga, etc. Part second is devoted to Cree Krishna, the Lord of Love. This is almost dithyrambic and shows a passion of devotion that seems strange and intense to the western world.

Some of the oriental sages who visit the new world come with high moral and religious purpose, are vegetarians, devoted to the ascetic life, perhaps have never tasted meat. These are the best. Some of them, however, gradually lapse to luxury. Instead of the rough garb of their ascetic sect, they come to wear fine robes, perhaps of silk of diverse colors. They succumb to the temptations of the western table, and some of them have lost their lives in yielding to the pleasures of sense. Others have been recalled, and yet others expelled from their orders. Some, too, have not been able to withstand the blandishments, adulations, flattery of men, and especially women, who have hung upon their words. Thus the temptations in this country of the missionary from the east are unique and insidious. It is greatly to be desired that they maintain the prestige of the pure and simple life which they preach.

*New America*. An organ of New Departure in Politics, Religion, Science, History and Literature, with special reference to new books and new knowledge. Edited by Rev. Edward C. Towne, Cambridge, Mass. Vol. 1, No. 1, January, 1905, pp. 128.

This initial number reveals clearly the editor's laudable ambition to lead the van of human progress in the new world. Electricity is the mother science of all. Its domain extends over all nature. Every blaze is an electrical phenomena. We now know the universal spirit of nature, the enormous electric power of each particle or atom, either is diffused electricity, there is no other energy or cause of motion, etc.

The ideal university, according to the editor, should bring man face to face with the practical problems of health, business, labor, society and politics. Divinity "faces backward toward traditions, which are more of superstition than they are of reason." Medicine does not make physicians "wise or learned in the causes and conditions of health and life." This is all due to superficial and inadequate scholarship. The new education will have no lesson getting, but require wide reading, with spoken and written digests. History will cover science and literature. In place of ancient, the modern languages will stand. Religion and law will be prominent. "There is no university in Christendom with anything like adequate study of the life and teaching of Christ."

From Wallace's new book, "Man's place in the Universe," the editor violently dissents. This earth is not the centre of a limited society, surrounded by empty space. Man is not the only sentient inhabitant of the universe in whom God devised the entire system to culminate. The earth is not approximately in the spacial centre. With Moffatt's "The Historical New Testament," the author is more in sympathy. According to this view, the New Testament was being developed from 30 to 150 A. D. The first of all writings was Paul's First Thessalonians, 51 A. D.; then came Galatians and First Corinthians, about 53; Romans, 55 or 56; Colossians and Ephesians, 61; Mark, 65 to 75; and last came James, Jude, and Second Peter. Thus, there was nothing except Paul in the field until Mark. Paul colors, determines, pervades everything, and has given us our Jesus and radically transformed him. He was first the hero of atrocious massacre. The Christ of the apostles "got in ahead of" the Jesus of history. Paul's preparation for his important rôle was his slaughter of almost the whole body of the out and out disciples of Christ whose memories were the living report of the teacher's words. This made the great silence of more than twenty years from 29 to 51 A. D., and cleared the way for Paul's unique interpretations. He worked Jesus into his own scheme and it was his own Christianity that was launched upon the world. It was Paul who made the Resurrection and expected the return of Jesus. It was he who altered the traditions and magnified and stirred the relations to the Old Testament. Jesus made little use of the Hebrew scriptures. Paul had much to do in making it a missionary religion. He had been "a moral monster," had "come into a habit of transvisions." He is as important for Christianity as Moses was thought to be for the Jewish faith and record. The true Jesus was simply a teacher and master, and, when thoroughly reconstructed, will shine forth for his moral virtues.

*The Religions of India*, by EDWARD WASHBURN HOPKINS. Handbooks on the History of Religions. Ginn & Co., Boston, 1902. pp. 612.

The author aims to make his reader know the religions of India rather than, as Barth does, to make them know all about them. He shows the lines on which the theological and moral conceptions of the Hindus developed, and takes the reader step by step through the literature. His work is rich in illustrative matter. Hopkins's book does not claim to add very much that is new to the expert Indologist. The author first describes the people and the land, then sets forth the Rig Vidas, with the upper, middle and lower gods, and describes the pantheism and eschatology of the system. The Atharva Veda represents a religion with the features all its own. The early Hindu deities are compared with those of other Aryans. He then considers Brahmanism and its pantheisms as set forth in Euphanasad and the popular Brahmanic faith. A chapter is devoted to Jainism; others each to Buddhism, early Hinduism, the Puranus, the modern Hindu sects, the religious traits of the wild tribes, and finally the relations to India and the West. On the whole we have here a very admirable and convenient compend, perhaps addressed especially to the novice.

*The Teaching of Jesus Concerning the Scriptures*, by DAVID JAMES BURRELL, D. D., LL. D. The American Tract Society, New York, 1904. pp. 211.

The writer begins with the antecedent as to the attitude of Jesus toward the scriptures. He then sets forth his actual attitude toward them and his scientific teaching concerning them, the provision he made for writing the New Testament, his silence as to alleged errors in the scriptures. The divinity of the Bible is shown by its history as compared to other great books. It has been printed in 500 languages and dialects. The Oxford version was issued in 2,500,000 copies, all disposed of within 48 hours after it came from the press. The telegraphic wires were kept busy to the exclusion of everything else in transmitting the gospels across the sea in a telegram of more than 100,000 words. Its truths are capable of codification, while Islam and Confucius have never been able to develop a system of dogmatic theology. "Aye, the written word and the incarnate word stand together. Neither can fall, but man will fall from either when he lets go the other. Blessed Bible, old-fashioned but not obsolete," etc.

*De Religion des Neuen Testaments*, von BERNARD WEISS, Berlin, 1903. p. 321.

This venerable former professor has so revised the work which only the

ideas it contains were first made popular in his Habilitation address in 1852 attracted much attention. Now, although it has been somewhat revised in his new edition, the best that can be said of it is that it is a solid piece of old school thinking which, no doubt, will probably fail to receive all the attention it deserves. The work is divided into three parts. The presupposition of salvation. The salvation in Christ and the realization of salvation. Before these comes an introduction treating the essence of christianity of the revelation of Scripture, and the relation between religion and physiology. In the first of the above parts, the writer treats the Being of God, world and man; sin and its results; the Divine order of the world; the preparation for salvation. In the second part he deals with the sin of God and man, the life and purpose of Jesus, the soteriological meaning of Jesus' death, the exalted Christ and the Holy Spirit, the word and sacrament. The third part deals with calling and election, faith and the state of salvation, regeneration, sanctification, perseverance and perfection, the church and the kingdom of God and the last things.

*The Messianic Hope in the New Testament*, by SHAILER MATTHEWS. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1905. pp. 338.

The author first describes the Messianism of the ancient Jews and their revolutionary programme. This really culminated in Zealotism and the fall of the Jewish state. The Messianism of Jesus when compared with that of Judaism shows really an essential identity of general scheme. In both there were two ages, the two kingdoms of God and Satan, the coming of the latter by a cataclysm, a day of judgment and resurrection and a personal Christ. The facts of Jesus' life have placed the resurrection on a very different basis, but in many respects the older part is not affected by the new one. Thus Christian Messianism is distinctly controlled by that of the ancient Jews. To be sure, the new life resulted from faith in Jesus and the interpenetration of the human and divine personalities, but even in Christian communities this was greatly checked by survivals of the ancient Jewish ideal. The latter furnished mediating concepts which were a great aid to new converts. These interpretative notions are historic and not theological, and prepare the way for a religious psychology. We may use any world view we please as the modern equivalent of Messianism.

*The Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia*. The Gifford Lectures on Ancient Egyptian and Babylonian Conceptions of the Divine, delivered in Aberdeen by A. H. SAYCE. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1903. pp. 509.

The subject of these lectures was originally the conception of the divine among the ancient Egyptians and Babylonians. The time has not yet come for a systematic history of Babylonian religion, whatever may be the case in Egypt. Little advance has been made in grasping the real nature and characteristics of the Babylonian religion. The material found in the author's previous Hibbert lectures is presupposed. For Egypt Maspero's great work summarizes the foundations of all our knowledge and adds to them. It is extraordinary how the new studies of old religions show continuity of thought. Egypt and Babylonia are the background for Judaism and Christianity. Indeed, the latter fulfills what was in all of these. In it the beliefs and aspirations of Egypt and Babylonia have found their explanation and fulfillment. On the other hand, between Judaism and the coarse pantheism of Babylonia, as between Christianity and the old Egyptian faith, despite its high morality and spiritual insight, there lies an impassable gulf. The division, the author thinks, is between revealed and unrevealed religion. It is like that something, hard to define, yet impossible to deny, which separates man from ape, although the ape may be man's ancestor. The author then proceeds to discuss the Egyptian view of the imperishable part of man and the other world, the sun god, and the Enead, animal worship, the gods of Egypt, Osiris, the sacred books, the popular religion, the place of Egyptian religion in the history of theology. Of Babylonia he treats the primitive animism which was the background of all the gods, especially the sun god and Istar, the Sumerian and Semitic conceptions of the divine, Assur and monotheism, cosmologies, the sacred books, myths and epics, the ritual and the temple, astro theology, and the moral element in Babylonian religion.



*The Religion of Duty*, by FELIX ADLER. McClure, Phillips & Co., New York, 1905. pp. 201.

These addresses are the central principles of the author's thought. Some have been published before, and another volume presenting a more practical side of his teachings is contemplated. For twenty-eight years he has been addressing large audiences regularly on Sunday. These, although delivered extemporaneously, have been recorded by capable stenographers. Those which express the central principles are here presented, although without the author's personal supervision. The topics treated here are the first steps toward religion; changes in the conception of God; teachings of Jesus in the modern world; the religion of duty; the essential difference between ethical societies and churches. We cannot regard the author as an original mind, but as a very earnest preacher of righteousness. His scholarship has not added to the sum of the world's knowledge, but he has borrowed from scholars and applied to life in a most fruitful way, and has bent his energies toward showing the supreme character of moral obligation and its essential independence from religion.

*The History of Modern Revivals*, by FRANK GRENVILLE BEARDSLEY, S. T. D. American Tract Society, New York, 1904. pp. 324.

After preliminary chapters on the Genesis of Revivals and the Religious Declension, and Attempts to Reform, the author devotes fifty pages to the Great Awakening, then passes to the Revolutionary periods, the Revival of 1800, the Denominational Movements, Finney, the Great Revival of 1858, the Lay movement in Revivals, Organized Movements. The work is very plain and pragmatic and the writer gives no sign even in his index that he has ever heard of any one of the score of recent new writers upon revival phenomena. The standpoint is pragmatic; the authorities are all conservative; the points of view orthodox. The author has, however, done service in going over this literature again and collecting its data afresh from his standpoint, but he has added nothing to our knowledge.

*The Growth of the Kingdom of God*, by SIDNEY L. GULICK. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, pp. 320.

This is one of those books which one does not quite like to call dishonest, but which only certain publishers will issue. Every indication of the time in which it is written is carefully scored away. In turning over the pages there is little to tell us whether the book is fresh from the press or a decade or two old. The volume that has just come to hand looks shopworn, and probably journals who limit their reviews to books within the last very few years will exclude this.

*The Web of Indian Life*, by the SISTER NIVEDITA (Margaret E. Noble) of Ramakrishna-Vive-Kananda. William Heinemann, London, 1904. pp. 301.

This is a unique and very interesting work by a native, and describes the eastern mother, the Hindu woman as wife, love strong as death, the place of woman in the national life, the immediate problem of the oriental woman, the Indian sagas, a study of Indian caste, synthesis of Indian thought, the wheel of birth and death, the story of the Great God, the gospel of the blessed one, Islam in India, and Indian pilgrimage, the web of Indian life on the loom of time.

*Ideals of Science and Faith*. Essays by various authors. Ed. by J. E. Hand. Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1904. pp. 333.

Addresses or articles by Oliver Lodge, Professors J. A. Thompson, J. H. Muirhead, V. V. Branford, Bertrand Russell, and Patrick Geddes illustrate the approaches through science and education, while four clergymen of different denominations write articles of rapprochement on the side of faith.

*Sacrificial Worship*, by WM. J. GOLD. Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1903. pp. 112.

These three lectures were delivered in Chicago in 1902, and constitute an attempt to express in untechnical language the basal principles of Christian worship as derived from scripture itself. The treatment is constructive and uncontroversial, and little account is taken of critical questions. It may perhaps be best described as a compilation, but is interesting and so well done as to be valuable.



*Education in Religion and Morals*, by GEORGE ALBERT COE. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, 1904. pp. 434.

The writer here gathers together and amplifies previous papers and includes others not previously published. The first treats of theory, the place of character, need of religious training, Christian view of childhood, education as development, punishment and play, reality and symbol, personal and social forces. The second part treats of the child, the religious impulse and its development, infancy, childhood and adolescence. The third part treats of the family, the Sunday School, societies, clubs, Christian academies and college, state schools; and the fourth part entitled "Perspective," treats of the church and child, a glance backward, education and present religious problems. A selected and classified bibliography is appended.

*Das Wesen des Christentums und die moderne historische Denkweise*, von KARL BETH. A. Deichert, Leipzig, 1904. pp. 135.

The writer first attempts a deductive and inductive exposition of the essence of Christianity. A purely historic method does not satisfy him. Primitive Christianity is not an all-sufficient source, and religious history needs to be supplemented by a larger view point.

*Otto Weininger. Sein Werk und sein Persönlichkeit*, von EMIL LUCKA. Wilhelm Braumüller, Leipzig, 1905. pp. 158.

In the last number of this *Journal* appeared a review of a volume largely devoted to a characterization of this extraordinary but certainly abnormal man. Here he is made the subject of a psychological analysis by another admirer who also publishes both abstracts and extracts from other unpublished papers which he left behind when he committed suicide in October, 1903.

*Two Thousand Years of Missions Before Carey*, by LEMUEL CALL BARNES. The Christian Culture Press, Chicago, 1902. pp. 504. 4th ed.

The writer first treats the genesis of missions, then their distribution in several Asiatic, African, European, South American, and other communities, and lastly their continuity. The book has a number of interesting illustrations and on the whole it is a work of much value despite the fact that Mr. Beach has in some respects transcended it. It is to be hoped that it will have a new edition.

*God and My Neighbor*, by ROBERT BLATCHFORD. Charles H. Kerr & Co., Chicago, 1904. pp. 197.

This writer is known for his "Merry England" and "Britain for the British." He is editor of "The Clarion," the best known English socialist newspaper. In this volume he states very frankly his conceptions of what he cannot believe, first, with regard to the Old Testament, then the New, and finally of Christian apologies. His programme is to eliminate from the world poverty, ignorance, crime, idleness, war, slavery, hate, envy, pride, greed, gluttony and vice. He thinks he finds much that illustrates or supports these hated things in Christianity and so rejects it.

*The Relations of the Advanced and the Backward Races of Mankind*, by JAMES BRYCE. (The Romanes Lecture, 1902.) Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1903. 2d ed. pp. 47.

This discourse has become somewhat memorable. The author attempts to glance over the countries in which higher races come into contact with or dominate lower races, and to draw certain conclusions. Sound as the author's opinion in general seems to us to be in insisting that backward races should have all the private and civil rights they can use for their own benefit, and any doubt whether any further admixture of higher and lower races is desirable, the author's view is essentially that of an advanced Englishman and of a politician rather than of an anthropologist. Races have been greatly reduced in number by extinction, absorption and admixture, and are being merged in a few great ones. The author's solution of the problem what can be done to mitigate antagonism, is, he confesses, vague.

*Über das Wesen des Christentums und seine modernen Darstellungen*, von ERICH SCHAEFER. E. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh, 1904. pp. 78.

- Sieben Abhandlungen über Vernunft Naturwissenschaft und Religion*, von WILHELM HAMMER. Paul Raatz, Berlin. pp. 48.
- Die Sittlichen Weisungen Jesu*, von W. HERRMANN. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1904. pp. 66. Preis, 3.20m.
- The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy*, by MAX MÜLLER. New Ed. Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1903. pp. 478.
- Science and Immortality*, by WILLIAM OSLER. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston, 1904. pp. 54.
- The Supremacy of Jesus*, by JOSEPH HENRY CROOKER. American Antiquarian Society, Boston, 1904. pp. 186.
- Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, by FRANCIS GREENWOOD PEABODY. The Macmillan Co., N. Y., 1901. pp. 374.
- The Mystics, Ascetics, and Saints of India*, by JOHN CAMPBELL OMAN. T. Fisher Unwin, London, 1903. pp. 291.
- Zionism and Anti-Semitism*, by MAX NORDAU and GUSTAV GOTTHEIL. (Contemporary Thought Ser.) Scott-Thaw Co., New York, 1904. pp. 76.
- Korea*, by ANGUS HAMILTON. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1904. pp. 313.
- The City of Refuge*, by HENRY TURNER BAILEY. The Davis Press, Worcester, Mass., 1903. pp. 15.
- Spiritual Experience and Theological Science. A Reconciliation.* By CHARLES CUTHBERT HALL. New York, 1904. The De Vinne Press. pp. 42.
- The Ethical Teaching of Jesus*, by CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1904. pp. 293.
- The Death of Christ*, by JAMES DENNEY. 4th ed. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 1903. pp. 334.
- Le Cénie Religieux.* Association Chrétienne Suisse d'Étudiants. pp. 47.
- The Sunday School in the Development of the American Church*, by OSCAR S. MICHAEL. The Young Churchman Co., Milwaukee, 1904, pp. 293.
- Koheleth oder Weltschmerz in der Bibel*, von PAUL HAUPT. J. C. Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1905. pp. 36.
- Néo-Christianisme et Littérature. Essai de Psychologie Contemporaine*, par HENRY D'ALLENS. J. Granié, Montauban, 1904. pp. 128.
- A Sketch of Semitic Origins Social and Religious*, by GEORGE AARON BARTON. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1902. pp. 342.



